QUARTERLY REVIEW.

VOL. 177.

PUBLISHED IN

JULY & OCTOBER, 1893.

LONDON:

JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET. 1893.

LONDON:

TTI TOY

Printed by William Clowes and Sons, Limited, Stamford Street and Charing Cross.

1743. CONTENTS No. 353

Aut.	Pe	age
mentary, and History Carto	North America; a Critical, Docu- oric Investigation, with an Essay graphy of the New World, &c.	
By Henry Harrisse	. Paris and London, 1892.	
Edward I. Payne,	Paris and London, 1892. W World, called America. By Fellow of University College, Oxford, at the Clarendon Press,	
	lumbus. By Charles I. Elton.	
London, 1892.		
4. The Journal of Cl first Voyage, 1492 the Voyages of Jo Translated, with	ristopher Columbus (during his -93), and Documents relating to hin Cabot and Gaspar Corte Real. Notes and an Introduction, by tham, C.B., F.R.S. Printed for y. London, 1893	1
IILife and Letters of th	e Right Honourable Robert Lowe,	
Viscount Sherbro Memoir of Sir J sometime Governo	oke, G.C.B., D.C.L. With a ohn Coape Sherbrooke, G.C.B., or-General of Canada. By A. 2 vols. London, 1893	42
quérant, par Baud by L. Delisle ('M	dèle, fille de Guillaume le Con- lri, Abbé de Bourgeuil. Edited lémoires de la Société des Anti- die, vol. xxviii.). Paris, 1870 -	73
	aracter: a Forecast. By Charles	
H. Pearson, LL.I	o., late Fellow of Oriel College, etime Minister of Education in	105
		LUC
Froceedings and C England. Edited 7 vols. 1834–7.	ordinances of the Privy Council of by Sir Harris Nicolas, K.C.M.G.	
2. The Diary of H	enry Machyn. Edited by John Camden Society, 1848.	
3. Acts of the Privy	Council of England. Edited by	
John Roche Daser	t. 6 vols. 1890-3 b	131

t	The Satires of A. Persius Flaccus, with a Translation and Commentary. By Prof. Conington. Oxford, 1872.	
2. 1	D. Junii Juvenalis Satiræ, with a literal English Prose Translation and Notes. By J. D. Lewis. London, 1873.	
8. 7	By Prof. Mayor. London, 1886.	
	Satires of Juvenal. By Messrs. Pearson and Strong. Oxford, 1887.	
5. 1	Satires of Juvenal. By E. G. Hardy, M.A. London,	152
	L'Art de la Reliure en France. Par M. E. Fournier. Paris, 1864.	
2. '	The Art of Bookbinding. By Joseph Zaehnsdorf. London, 1880.	
	La Reliure Française depuis l'Invention de l'Im- primerie jusqu'à la Fin du 18 ^{me} Siècle. Par MM. Marius-Michel. Paris, 1880.	
4.	On Bookbindings Ancient and Modern. By Joseph	178
	La chute de l'Ancien Régime. Par Aimé Cherest. 3 vols. Paris, 1886.	
	Histoire de Marie-Antoinette. Par Maxime de la Rocheterie. Second Edition. 2 vols. Paris, 1882.	
	L'Esprit révolutionnaire avant la Révolution. Par Félix Rocquain. Paris, 1878	212
2.	Twenty-five Years in the Secret Service. The Recollections of a Spy. By Major Henri Le Caron. Second Edition. London, 1892. Secret Service under Pitt. By W. J. Fitzpatrick, F.S.A. Second Edition, enlarged. London, 1892	23
X	And other Works. —A Leap in the Dark; or, Our New Constitution. By A. V. Dicey, Q.C. London, 1893	26

CONTENTS

IV.-4. A Remainsted and Streetly Defining at the Pear-ncy and Representation (Paris Dec. et Berlie, 114.0).

TAA

No. 354.

152

178

212

235

265

Sir William Smith,

D.U.L., Ida.D.	
ART. Pa	go
I.—1. The World's Columbian Exposition, Official Guide. Chicago, 1893.	
 The Daily News Almanac and Political Register. Chicago, 1893. 	
3. The American Commonwealth. By James Bryce, M.P. Second Edition. London, 1893.	
4. The Principles of Ethics. Vol. II. By Herbert Spencer. London, 1893.	
 Sur l'Inégalité des Races humaines. Par M. le Comte de Gobineau. Deuxième Édition. Paris, 	97
II.—1. The Times, July 11, 1893. Official Programme of the Naval Manœuvres of 1893.	1 6
 The Influence of Sea Power upon History, 1660– 1783. By Captain A. T. Mahan, United States Navy. London, 1890. 	
 The Influence of Sea Power upon the French Revo- lution and Empire, 1798–1812. By Captain A. T. 	29
III.—1. Annals of Winchester College, from its Foundation in the year 1382 to the present time. By T. F.	
Kirby, M.A., F.S.A., Bursar of Winchester College, formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. London and Winchester, 1892.	
2. Wykehamics. By the Rev. H. C. Adams, M.A., late Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford. Oxford,	
London, and Winchester, 1878.	
 Life of William of Wykeham. By George Herbert Moberly, M.A., late Fellow of Corpus Christi College, Oxford. Winchester and London, 1893. 	
4. The Life of William of Wykeham. By Bishop Lowth. London, 1759 8	58

	_
 A Genealogical and Heraldic Dictionary of the Peerage and Baronetage. By Sir Bernard Burke, LL.D., Ulster King-of-Arms. London, 1893. Complete Peerage of England, Scotland, Ireland, Great Britain and the United Kingdom, extant, extinct, or dormant. Vols. IIV. By G. E. C. 	Page 386
 V.—1. Napoléon et Alexandre. Par Albert Vandal. Vol. I. Paris, 1891. Alexandre et Napoléon. Par Serge Tatistchef. Paris, 1891 	416
VI.—Vedische Mythologie. Von Alfred Hillebrandt. Erster Band: Soma und verwandte Götter. Breslau, 1891	
 VII.—1. Hospitals and Asylums of the World. By Henry C. Burdett. London, 1892. 4 vols. First, Second, and Third Reports of the Select Committee of the House of Lords of Metropolitan Hospitals, &c. Printed for Her Majesty's Stationery Office. London, 1890, 1891, 1892. Burdett's Hospital Annual for 1893. London, 1893. Suffering London. By J. Egmont Hake. London, 	
1892. 5. Cottage Hospitals, General, Fever, and Convalescent; their Progress, Management, and Work. By Henry C. Burdett. Second Edition. London, 1880 And other Works.	
 VIII.—1. The Skeptics of the Italian Renaissance. By John Owen. London, 1893. Pietro Pomponazzi: studi storici su la Scuola Bolognese e Padovano del secolo xvi. Per Francesco Fiorentino. Firenze, 1868. Sulla Immortalità dell'Anima di Pomponazzi: esame storico-filosofico, con l'aggiunta di molti documenti inciditi. Per G. Fontana. Siona 1860. 	
4. La Psicologia di Pietro Pomponazzi secondo un manoscritto inedito dell' Angelica di Roma. Del	495
IX. The Earl of Aberdeen. By the Hon. Sir Arthur	525
 X.—1. Parliamentary Debates. Session 1893. 2. Speech of the Rt. Hon. W. E. Gladstone in Edinburgh, Sept. 27, 1893 	
A. The Isle of Wilson's University Italian A. The Isle of Wilson's University In History Levels, Incident 1753	

SIR WILLIAM SMITH, D.C.L., LL.D.

WHILE these pages are in the press, we have sustained a loss which cannot pass unnoticed and unlamented.

The pilot who for more than twenty-six years has shaped the course and controlled the destinies of the Quarterly Review has been suddenly taken away while his hand was actually on the helm.

In WILLIAM SMITH the Quarterly Review has lost an Editor who will stand comparison with any of those who have gone before him; for if, in his characteristics and accomplishments, he differed widely from such men as William Gifford or John Gibson Lockhart, he resembled both in tact and judgment, and in zealous resolve to maintain the highest standard of literary merit; while in gauging the public taste, and in those business qualities which are ever becoming more and more essential to the successful Editor, he was probably surpassed by none of his predecessors.

He may in truth be said to have possessed a genius for editing, and he was called upon to show it in circumstances which put his powers to the severest test. Whoever has observed the extent to which journalism in the present day has encroached on the domain of permanent literature, the enormous increase in the number of periodical publications, and the constant fluctuations of taste among readers, will understand how great a revolution has occurred in the world of letters since 1867.

From that date till the day of his death Sir William Smith was responsible for the control of the Quarterly Review, with an old and cherished tradition to maintain, and with new public Vol. 177.—No. 354.

tastes to satisfy. Though these pages are not the place in which the measure of his success can most fitly be estimated, it is just that they should bear testimony to the value of his services and should call attention to the magnitude and difficulty of his task.

It must not be forgotten that the responsibility of an Editor is greater in an organ the contributors to which write anonymously, than in one where the articles are signed by their respective authors: in the one case a writer is in a great measure free to state his own personal views; in the other he must conform, or be induced to conform, to the general policy of the periodical for which he writes. We believe that Sir William Smith, during his long term of editorship, had no serious difference with any contributor. He was not an Editor in name only, but in every number he had to curtail, to alter, to harmonize, and to amend, often to a considerable extent; yet his courtesy, his firmness, his straightforwardness, and his literary experience enabled him to do this in a manner which almost invariably gained the assent—not unfrequently the thanks—of the writers themselves.

In such dealings with men a man shows his true nature. Like William Gifford, William Smith owed his position less to external circumstances than to his innate force of character and industry: his judgment, like Gifford's, was sought for and accepted, not only by the young and inexperienced, but by those whose name and ability are known to all the world.

Our duty has been to speak of him in his capacity of Editor of this Review—of his editorial ability in other directions his best monument is his work; and if design, organization, and judgment be essential to the success of any undertaking, the stores of permanently valuable knowledge, which have been supplied to the country under his supervision, entitle his name to an honourable place in the annals of English Literature.

QUARTERLY REVIEW.

ART. I.—1. The Discovery of North America; a Critical, Documentary, and Historic Investigation, with an Essay on the Early Cartography of the New World, &c. By Henry Harrisse. Paris and London, 1892.

2. History of the New World, called America. By Edward I. Payne, Fellow of University College, Oxford. Vol. I.

Oxford, at the Clarendon Press, 1892.

3. The Career of Columbus. By Charles I. Elton. London, 1892.

4. The Journal of Christopher Columbus (during his first Voyage, 1492-93), and Documents relating to the Voyages of John Cabot and Gaspar Corte Real. Translated, with Notes and an Introduction, by Clements R. Markham, C.B., F.R.S. Printed for the Hakluyt Society. London, 1893.

THE series of American celebrations which began last year, and which have reached their crowning point in that city of white palaces by the waters of Lake Michigan which is known as the 'World's Fair' at Chicago, have naturally called forth, not indeed poets to rhyme about them, but historians, critical or philosophical, intent on glorifying the discovery which they commemorate, or of tracing out its many consequences to mankind. But in their several ways, Mr. Harrisse, the well-known author of the 'Bibliotheca Americana Vetustissima,' and his Oxford rival Mr. Payne, have carried off the palm from their fellows. No praise could be too great for the immense research, prolonged and microscopic labour, and seemingly faultless accuracy, which are the chief characteristics of Mr. Harrisse's splendid volume. It sums up in one view the monographs already published by him on Columbus, on John and Sebastian Cabot, on the Cortereals and Verrazzano, Vol. 177 .- No. 353.

and on the first explorers of the American Seas. And all this vast encyclopædia-from which it would appear that no fact, however slight, bearing on the discovery, has been omitted-rests upon original documents which have undergone the severest examination, and are here reproduced, sometimes in facsimile, with an accompanying description of no fewer than two hundred and fifty maps or globes constructed before the year 1536. Furthermore, Mr. Harrisse lays down 'the chronology of one hundred voyages westward projected, attempted, or accomplished, between 1431 and 1504.' He gives us biographical accounts, which will be read with interest, of 'the three hundred pilots who first crossed the And he concludes with a list of the original American names of places, drawn from the early documents. which is of great value in itself, and which furnishes the data of his criticism as applied with discriminating severity to stories long current, but now in various details shown to be false or at least open to suspicion. His volume is not for reading, in the ordinary somewhat indolent sense of that word, but for reference. It is a statement of facts with the evidence appended which belongs to them, and in this light is undoubtedly

a model for historians.

Mr. Harrisse limits his ambition to 'bringing into view the principal elements of knowledge,' concerning the discovery of America, 'which are accessible at the present time,' and to 'setting forth their literal meaning, their purport, and their importance.' His eight hundred pages, studded with maps and illustrations, exemplify the modern method, 'now exacted in every branch of science,' which passes by no minor proofs, delights in the analysis of particulars, sums up results in columns of arithmetic, and would surely be infallible if genius were indeed the faculty of taking pains ad infinitum. 'The question,' says Mr. Harrisse in his brief and modest Introduction, 'whether historical works, ancient or modern, are likely to possess for our successors any lasting value beyond that of the bare facts which they will have been found to afford, must perhaps be answered in the negative.' And therefore to such bare facts he confines himself as far as possible. Yet, in following them up, he is constantly entangled in thickets no less dense than those through which Nuñez de Balbao was compelled to cut his way, when crossing from the Atlantic to the Pacific Ocean. Even the most documentary of inquirers will have, at last, to interrogate the human mind; and the mind of a Columbus, nay of a Cortes or a Pizarro, is a great abyss. We can never escape psychology. And the much-debated question whether whether Columbus knew, or did not know, that the American was not the Asiatic coast, will afford as good an instance as we could desire, of the depths into which analysis must travel, if it

would always be victorious.

1

h

r

n

IS

e

re

d

d,

re

t,

10

n-

he

 \mathbf{ill}

8

Ve

on

er

For, amusingly enough, Mr. Payne, however willing to take all the evidence which Mr. Harrisse can offer him, not only differs from the student of facts on this particular point, but lays down exactly the opposite theory in general. 'Of history it may be said,' he remarks, 'that the modern reader demands the functions of a Sibyl rather than of a Muse. The mind revolts from a mere recital of facts, however undeniable may be their truth. It requires the proof and the interpretation of their significance.' To him, therefore, 'scientific history becomes a continuous record of the genesis of events.' It must be living, not a 'dead narrative, containing nothing that can be challenged or disproved.' A true conception of history, says Mr. Payne once more, requires the mental eye to be dilated rather than contracted, and the poet is nearer the true standpoint of the historian than the pedant and the antiquary.' To the same effect Sir Philip Sidney wrote long ago in his persuasive style :-

'And even historiographers, although their lips sound of things done, and verity be written in their foreheads, have been glad to borrow both fashion and, perchance, weight of the poets: so Herodotus entitled the books of his history by the names of the Nine Muses; and both he, and all the rest that followed him, either stole or usurped, of poetry, their passionate describing of passions, the many particularities of battles which no man could affirm; or, if that be denied me, long orations, put in the mouths of great kings and captains, which it is certain they never pronounced.'

This is a very pretty quarrel as it stands, nor would we for the world disarm either combatant, in the too precise spirit of a Justice of the Quorum before whom information has been laid that a breach of the peace is impending. Yet, as we cannot see our way to dispensing with Mr. Harrisse's great collection of facts, however-we will not say dry, but-dessicated, and as we have found Mr. Payne in a very high degree stimulating and suggestive, perhaps it may be allowed us to point out, as in a parable, that even 'scientific history' must have a mill in which to grind its corn, if it has any to grind. The full record of any twenty-four hours would exhaust a million volumes. All our chronicles are, of necessity, written in shorthand; and who is to determine what shall be put into them, and what left out? We must proceed on some principle of discrimination, and this means B 2 philosophy. philosophy. 'To observe, to enquire, and to record,' as Mr. Payne reiterates, 'no longer make up the main function of the historian.' They never really did so. Do we set no value upon Herodotus, Thucydides, Tacitus, and Gibbon, 'beyond that of the bare facts which they will be found to afford'? And is it not true, in the language of the Oxford writer, that 'the consequences of the discovery' made by Columbus 'are undoubtedly of greater moment than its causes and surroundings'? In other words, is there not a proportion among facts, leading us to throw some into the background and to bring out others into

bold relief?

Certainly there are 'main lines into which the perspective of history properly falls,'-the trouble is to ascertain them. Nor can we help feeling grateful to a Tacitus, though never so given to dwelling on the darker aspects of the time, or to a Gibbon, even when his grouping becomes slightly theatrical and his estimate of the causes in operation is more Voltairean than we think just, for the happy tact with which they have made their histories living, and for the large and clear picture, incorrect, it may be, in many a detail, which we cannot forget after once studying it. Now no man could carry away with him the infinite particulars of Mr. Harrisse's cartography and bibliography. But then, it was never meant that he should. he has the book on his shelves, he may be forgiven if he does not charge his memory with it as well. And, supposing him to be interested in what is a pleasant, no less than a seasonable, line of research, on his shelves Mr. Harrisse's volume ought to be. It has something of the vastness proper to American subjects, and is a monument, in its own way, as remarkable as the Exhibition of wonders at Chicago, which it is destined to outlast by many years. Yet writing as we are in the presence of those lovely temples, domes, and colonnades, under the burning American sky which adds a light and a transparency to all it rests upon, we cannot help echoing the regrets which are heard on all sides that this vision of beauty is but for a season. Hereafter, mayhap, some one of the new dynasties of kings which have arisen in the land will, like Augustus, perpetuate his name in marble, by restoring, on the edge of this immense capital, amid parks and waters, that great central square which, were it only built of enduring materials, would stand without a rival in modern architecture.

In reading Mr. Payne, we have been reminded of a once famous work on 'Civilization in Europe,' by the late Thomas Henry Buckle. His erudition is vast, and in its own style not

inferior

inferior to that which Mr. Harrisse heaps together from the libraries of two continents. No science comes amiss to him; beginning with the political economy of maize and barley, of cacao, cotton, and the potato, Mr. Payne advances with the assistance of all the American languages towards an explanation of the rites, customs, manner of life and peculiarities of government, by which the aborigines were distinguished when the Spaniards landed among them. He shows a firm faith in Buckle's method of reducing the phenomena, which we call social, to a primary physical basis. 'Out of the eater came forth meat' was Samson's riddle; and to the disciples of M. Comte, fairly represented by such men as Buckle and Mr. Payne, it would appear that out of the cannibal came forth civilization. They explain the soul by the body, genius by the food it lives upon, cultivated man by the savage, and things heavenly by things earthly. Lord Bacon has told us that 'the knowledge of man is as the waters, some descending from above, and some springing from beneath; the one informed by the light of nature, the other inspired by divine revelation.' But no spiritual sun shines in these speculations of the minute philosopher. Therefore, while he is instructive, we cannot but find him a little wearisome. His pedestrian style moves along dusty desert paths; and though we learn from him, we are not delighted. The heroic phrase and the spirit of chivalry which make the first of the Spanish historians such noble reading, and of which there is more than an echo in Hakluyt, Ralegh, and Chateaubriand, have vanished from this recital:-

a

d

n

e

T

e

)-

le

es

to

e,

to

s.

he

se

it

rd

n.

gs

ate

ise

ch,

t a

nce

nas

not

rior

'Philosophy, that leaned on Heaven before, Sinks to her second cause and is no more.'

For our part, we prefer Washington Irving. That most agreeable writer has caught the very mood and colour of the times in which were done such immortal feats. Mr. Elton, also, whose taking style recalls Irving, and who gives in popular form the results of Mr. Harrisse's investigations, has succeeded where the Oxford writer leaves us cold. He dwelfs, with a poetical warmth, on the plans, adventures, and misfortunes of Columbus; achieving in modest dimensions, a picture which will be studied by the many to whom the personality of a hero is more attractive than inquiries about the growth of uncivilized races. It is a pleasant piece of biography, clearly conceived and well told. As for Comte and Buckle, if they do not deserve to be named, in the severe language of another school, the 'hyenas of literature,' they are at least its Gibeonites. They bring wood for the sacrifice and fill the trenches with

water:

water; but always we need an Elijah when we would draw

down the fire from heaven.

For an historian, Mr. Payne has no brilliant pictures to set He is wanting in the poetic insight which would enable him to understand, or to delineate, a character so remote from the ideas of the nineteenth century as was that of Columbus. What will it avail to judge these medieval adventurers by the humanitarian standard, which religion has had so little share in determining, of 'enlightenment and progress'? If we are to understand the men of the past, we must take them in the conditions of their own day, framed about by the ideals in which they believed, and not by ours which were unknown to them. Columbus was no more a Humboldt than he was a Bernardin de Saint-Pierre. The scientific spirit ruled in him as little as did the passion for the picturesque. He looked on himself, observes Mr. Payne with hardly disguised contempt, 'as an instrument chosen by the Almighty for the accomplishment of an appointed end.' His ambition, we are told, never was to find out a New World, but only to bear the Gospel to the Indies, to convert Asia to the worship of Christ. and to pour its treasures into the hands of Spain, so that thereby a crusade might be fitted out, Islam vanquished, the Holy Sepulchre recovered, and the reign of the Messiah hastened in its coming. A Quixotic dream, as our author implies. But is there nothing more to be said of it? That dream, which kindled the imaginations and inspired the hearts of Spaniards during a hundred years after the death of Columbus, and which took as serious and sober a form in the meditations, the enterprises, and the policy of Ignatius Loyola and Francis Xavier, as it put on a grotesque and comic mask in the romance of Cervantes, had its world-wide consequences in East and West. America, seen in the light of 'a field for human progress,' would have drawn from the gates of Granada, or from the walls of Pampeluna, not a single knight. Considered as the road to the Holy Sepulchre, and a fresh battlefield where the Crusade of eight centuries might still be carried on, it attracted thousands. Neither must we doubt the accomplishment, though in grander form and at the end of a perspective which he could not measure, of the vision that aroused and sustained the Discoverer's enthusiasm.

Had his temperament been that of the mere philosopher, Columbus would have stayed at home, sketching new maps upon the imaginary data of the Ptolemies and their commentators, but leaving the Atlantic unexplored. He was, however, happily for the world, an untaught enthusiast,—'de muy alto ingenio, sin saber saber muchas lettras,' remarks Bernaldez, in words which take us back to Ben Jonson and Shakespere's 'little Latin and less Greek.' Few passages are more striking in their calm manliness of tone than the description he gave of himself to Ferdinand and Isabella, when writing to them in the year 1501:—

'At a very early age,' he says, 'I became a sailor, and a sailor I have been ever since. The sailor's calling breeds in those who follow it a desire to know the secret things of this earth. During forty years have I followed that calling. Whithersoever men have sailed to this day, thither have I also sailed. I have held traffic and converse with the wise and prudent, churchmen and laymen, Latins and Greeks, Jews and Moors, and many others of other persuasions. I found the Lord to be gracious to this my desire, and received from Him the spirit of understanding. In seamanship He made me abundant; of astrology He gave me as much as sufficeth, also geometry and arithmetic: also wit in mind and hand to draw the sphere, and therein the cities, rivers and mountains, islands and ports, each in his proper place. During this time have I seen, and made it my study to see, all writings, cosmography, histories, chronicles, philosophies, and other arts, so that the hand of the Lord plainly opened my understanding to see that it was possible to sail from hence to the Indies, and set on fire my will for the execution thereof, and with this fire came I to your Highnesses.' *

In such a man we can afford to pardon his reliance on Abbot Joachim of Calabria, and perhaps even that desire for gold which was prompted, not by personal avarice, but by his longing to collect the treasures that were to furnish forth the new Crusaders and win from the Moslem his Redeemer's tomb.

The Discovery of America, observes Mr. Payne, was the noblest fruit of the Renaissance. But it was something more. While it fulfilled a dream of science, it gave the answer to presentiments which had long haunted the foolish equally with the wise, and it possessed the unspeakable charm of a fairy tale that turns out to be true even as we are telling it. In rehearsing its details we enjoy a pleasure not unlike that of the audience which has been let into the secret of a tragic story put upon the stage, the actors in which know nothing but their own parts and work out the dénoûment unconsciously. It is a prospect covered with mist and cloud when first we turn our eyes that way, like the dawn among Alpine snows; and a fascination holds us while we watch the great peaks emerging into light, above valleys of rolling vapour, a glint of sunshine here, and

^{*} Payne, p. 109 (the translation slightly altered).

there a rosy flush, until the clouds are broken and scattered, the sky clears, and the whole scene comes out as a picture, of which all the lines and colours unite to present us with a view as grand as it is extensive, but only now comprehensible in every part. The revelations succeeding one another of coasts and seas and mountains; the slow but sure uprising into visible and enduring reality of a whole continent, stretching from Antarctic ice to the frozen seas of Greenland, forming a barrier between Europe and the Indies which was thousands of miles across; and, behind this enormous bulk, the vision of the Pacific, -a new Ocean to keep company with the New World whose shores it laved,—these things, which came upon the seafarers of Spain and Portugal with a shock of surprise, now afford us the elements of a delighted curiosity. We feel as though we had known from the first those outlines which, only by a courage and faith in the ideal that could do and dare the utmost, Columbus himself, and John Cabot, and the Cortereals, and the Pinzons, Vespuccis, Cabrals, and Magalhaens, were able in the course of thirty years' wanderings to conquer from the aboriginal darkness

wherein they lay hidden.

It was a unique experience in the history of mankind. The voyage of Columbus from Gomera in September 1492, however long it had been preparing, opens the true Odyssey of modern men, which has since, in successive chants of exile and adventure, been so splendidly continued, and most of all by English captains, from Hawkins, Frobisher, and Davis, to Anson, Cook, Franklin, and Nares. How many hundred years ago it was that some 'nameless Greek' discovered the solid earth to be a sphere which one might sail round, and not a flat disk floating in ocean, we can scarcely reckon. But the truth, neglected for centuries, was certain to bear fruit at last. In this sense, the principles of Science are prophecies; all they ask is to be interpreted and applied. The Greeks had, as usual, found the idea, and in the writings of their Secretary General-we mean Aristotle, of course—they had consigned it for the guidance of after-times, when these should be capable of learning from the Master. Commerce, however, intent long ago on pushing its conquests across the untravelled waters, from Tyrus at the entrance of the sea, which was, in the language of Ezekiel, 'a merchant of the people for many isles,' had already crept round the coasts of the Mediterranean to Tarshish, 'the Mexico and Peru of antiquity.' Little by little, it had come to know its bearings in the Ægean, the Syrtic, and the Tyrrhenian basins, of the Great Inland Sea. The Phocæans, who, as Herodotus reports, were the first of the Hellenes that used long ships,

ships, had explored the Adriatic and the Tuscan coasts, founded Massilia in the year 600 B.C., and reached Spain and Tartessus thirty or forty years later. In the same age it appears that the Egyptian king Neko, son of Psammetichus, despatched a Phœnician fleet on a voyage of discovery from the Red Sea, and that they circumnavigated Libya, returning to Egypt by way of the Pillars of Hercules, after an absence which lasted three years. 'And their story,' remarks Herodotus, 'was one which I cannot believe, though others may, that in sailing round Libya, they had the sun on their right hand;' that is to say, to the north of them .- a circumstance which no sailor would have invented, and which confirms the reality of their voyage. But the well-known 'Periplus' which bears, though doubtless by mistake, the name of Scylax, and is previous to Alexander, tells us how 'beyond Cerne'—an island far to the south-west of the Pillars of Hercules—' the sea is no longer navigable by reason of shallows and mud and sea-weed.' It is evident that some of these old-world mariners had found themselves on the fringe of that Sargasso Sea, which Columbus was the first of mortals to cross, and the thick and floating fucus of which, extending over thirty degrees of latitude, accompanied his journey until within a week of his arriving at San Salvador. If we grant that the Assyrians originated the conception of a Great Sea in the West distinct from the other which they knew in the East, and if to the Phænicians must be allowed the honour of naming Europe and Asia, fixing the boundaries of the Mediterranean, and circumnavigating Africa, we have merely to add the discovery of an 'Ultima Thule,' which was perhaps Iceland, by Pytheas the Massilian (whom Strabo calls 'a great liar'), and we shalk have traced the actual progress that was made by the ancients towards penetrating into the 'Sea of Darkness' and learning whither its mysterious waters led. The sun alone which went down into the Atlantic could tell what lay on the night-side of things. And thus, during the long space between Aristotle and the rediscovery of the Canaries, or Fortunate Isles, in 1344, dreams, conjectures, and mere notions à priori, filled the minds whether of seamen or savants, when the unknown regions of the globe were talked of. That most ancient mariner, the Achæmenid Sataspes, upon whom the circumnavigation of Africa was imposed as a punishment 'worse than death' by Xerxes, had returned with his task unfulfilled, affirming that he had sailed 'until his ship stuck fast and could move on no farther.' Such perils were still thought to hinder the path of exploration till Columbus unlocked the secret of the West. Even in Roman

times, the poet Pedo Albinovanus puts into the mouth of his hero Germanicus, who is imagined as sailing westward over the Atlantic, words of fear and discouragement:

'Quo ferimur? ruit ipse dies, orbemque relictum
Ultima perpetuis claudit natura tenebris:
Anne alio positas ultra sub cardine gentes
Atque alium libris intactum querimus orbem?
Di revocant, rerumque vetant cognoscere finem
Mortaleis oculos: aliena quid æquora remis
Et sacras violamus aquas, Divûmque quietas
Turbamus sedes?'

But in the school of Aristotle, and the discussions of philosophers, as well as in the poetic dreams of men more finely endowed than Pedo Albinovanus, the idea of possible discoveries lingered when navigation had come to a standstill. In the treatise 'De Mundo,' it is asserted that 'the inhabited world, as known to us, is really a single island, lying in the midst of the Atlantic. Probably there are other such worlds, some larger, some smaller, separated from ours by the Ocean.' One of these Aristotle placed in the Southern Hemisphere, as a Terra Australis, divided by the sea from Africa; and thus Mr. Pavne is well warranted in ascribing to him a belief in 'some kind of America, and some kind of Australia.' Nevertheless, true to his principle of leaving possibilities open, the great philosopher subjoined that mayhap in our hemisphere there was but one 'oikoumené,' or habitable world,-in which case the two ends of it would perhaps lie at no great distance apart on so diminutive a sphere as, in opposition to Plato, he figured the earth to be. On this second line of reasoning Columbus relied, when he set out to reach India by sailing westward from Spain. So that we may apply to the elder Greek what D'Anville has said of Ptolemy, who divided the globe into equal parts of land and water, while extending Africa to the South Pole, that 'the greatest of geographical errors' was 'the seed of the discovery of the greatest of geographical truths.' Columbus never could be persuaded that the coast of America was not the Indies which he had endeavoured to reach. He felt no drawing to Aristotle's first notion of 'many worlds' in the Ocean; and, clinging to the second, he may even be said, with the truth which paradox often brings out, never to have discovered that America whose existence as a separate continent he would not recognize. Yet how astonishing it is that, long before any scientific measurement of the earth had been taken, two suppositions were started, either of which held within within it the principles of the great discovery! For the plurality of 'worlds,' or island-continents, had express approval from the 'master of those that know'; and the westward route on which Columbus actually travelled was but a deduction from the sphericity of the earth, combined with a false belief in the near neighbourhood of Eastern Asia to

Western Europe.

This second inference, however, sustained a notable check when Eratosthenes, in the age of Ptolemy, measured a degree upon the meridian between Svene and Alexandria, and came nigh to ascertaining the true size of the planet. According to Strabo, his view extended the Atlantic to one hundred and thirty thousand stadia in the latitude of Athens, leaving to the dry land only seventy thousand more, and thus discouraging exploration by the breadth of the vast ocean solitudes which must be traversed if East and West were to be at length joined by the daring seaman. A globe constructed on the data of Eratosthenes would, says Mr. Payne, have shown the distance from Spain to Further India with great exactitude. And though Strabo himself regards the interval as too wide for sailors to attempt crossing it, he goes on, mindful of the first Aristotelian theory, to suggest that the temperate zone may contain two or more island-continents, and perhaps in the latitude of Athens,-words which might well seem prophetic when the discovery had been accomplished. Posidonius, who stretched out the dimensions of the known world from one-third to onehalf of the circumference, was bolder still. 'It might be a long way,' he said, 'but with a good east wind at your back, it could be done.' Some sixteen hundred years later, it was found that Nature had provided, in the shape of the trade-winds, exactly that means of impulsion across the sea which Posidonius demanded. The inquiry which Seneca put to himself in the preface to his 'Natural Questions' is most interesting; and the reply still more so, 'Quantum enim est,' he asks his reader, 'quod ab ultimis littoribus Hispaniæ usque ad Indos jacet?' and he replies, 'Paucissimorum dierum spatium, si navem suus ventus implevit.'

Seneca, we know, was a poet no less than the father of essayists and dilettanti men of science; and the thrice-famous passage in his play called 'Medea' has an air of the loftiest inspiration, though it does but anticipate better ships than the Romans could build, while slightly filling up Aristotle's conjecture of 'more worlds than ours,' which he must have learnt through Strabo. They are fine lines, and, however often

quoted, still keep their prophetic seeming:-

Venient annis secula seris
Quibus Oceanus vincula rerum
Laxet, et ingens pateat tellus,
Tiphysque novos detegat orbes,
Nec sit terris ultima Thule.'

No wonder that Columbus wrote these verses twice over in his 'Profecias,' or that learned Europe took them for a divine intuition, vouchsafed to the heathen moralist. It was Seneca's habit to look forward; he trusted in the 'diligence of a later day,' nor have we yet exhausted the promise of those inspiriting sentences in which he assures us, 'Veniet tempus quo posteri nostri tam aperta nos nescisse mirentur.' Such also had been the day-dreams of Cicero; his delight was to picture that second continent as a part of the great cosmic scheme, inhabited by men like those in the old world and equally under the care of Providence. His commentator, Macrobius, appears to have crudely sketched even a northern and a southern division, on the farther side of the globe, corresponding to the two Americas. And the modern expression of the 'New World' was not unknown either to poets or geographers when they wrote of an alter orbis, or, like Tibullus, invited the Roman arms to extend their dominions beyond the sun,-

> 'Te manet invictus Romano Marte Britannus, Teque interjecto mundi pars altera sole.'

But now, with a side glance at Augustine's denial of the Antipodes, and due admiration of Dante's mighty lines, in which he makes Ulysses challenge his comrades to follow the sun in his flight, nor refuse the experience of that unpeopled world which lay in the West, we pass on to the fresh dawn of literature; the stirring of an adventurous spirit which was resolved to tempt all waters, and the Age of Discoveries lit up for ever by the three unparalleled voyages of Columbus, Vasco di Gama, and Magalhaens.

Certainly it is true, as Mr. Payne reminds us, that exploration has followed the general growth of culture, and that the discovery of a New World was no accident or happy chance. It came in due sequence to 'a long series of bold nautical ventures,' themselves inspired by an intellect which was gradually waking up to its own powers and possibilities. Step by step the reasoning of which that event was the outcome, advanced to its slow conclusion. But if a seafaring and civilized race had occupied the shores of what is now Virginia, the discovery of Europe from the West, and not of the West from Europe, must have occurred at an early date. Winds and currents in the

North Atlantic, within the European latitudes, set directly from the American coasts towards Spain, France, and the Isles of Britain. Westerly winds prevail during most part of the year, and their force is three times as great as that of the occasional breezes which blow from the north and east. Nor is the constant set of the Gulf Stream less unfavourable to Western expeditions. Ever drifting upon the shores of Europe pinetrunks, branches of tropical plants, and the flotsam and jetsam of wrecked canoes, and wafting the Sargasso grass even into the Bristol Channel, it seemed silently to indicate the existence of unknown lands beyond the Ocean, while barring the gates through which an entrance might be attempted. Northward and southward, however, the ways were open; and as the

currents ruled, so the discovery was in fact made.

First, there is the great Arctic current, turning southwards from Davis's Straits, carrying with it the waters around Greenland, and then sweeping south along the North American shore, until it is dominated by the mighty Gulf Stream, which moves north-eastward. Second, consider the trade-winds, due to the combined action of the sun's heat and the earth's diurnal motion, how they blow westward between the tropics all the year round, north of the Equator tending to the south-west, and south of the Equator to the north-west. Last of all let us take into our reckoning the great Equatorial current, as it sweeps with the trade-winds from the shores of Africa to Brazil and the estuary of the Amazon river. Such are the three roads, laid open by enormous physical forces, and strictly a result of the terrestrial system, which invited men along them to the Western Continent. As soon as maritime adventure had reached Greenland, it was likely that one day or other a boat would find itself drifting upon the Arctic current towards Labrador. Again, if seamen coasting round Northern Africa, and hazarding their vessels some distance out in the Atlantic, should pass the tropic of Cancer and attain the Cape de Verde Islands, they would be in the grasp of the trade-winds, and the desire of Posidonius and Seneca, 'a good east wind at your back,' would be accomplished. But sailing still farther south and west beyond the Line, these same mariners would inevitably come into the great Equatorial current, and a blast of the hurricane might hurl them across the ocean upon the primeval forest-crowned shores of Brazil. Nothing, of course, can be more simple than to prophesy after the event. But still, all these things did come to pass, and precisely in the order here set down. The Norsemen, between the years 874 and 1007, were carried by the Arctic current to Labrador, Nova Scotia, and New England. They did not either either colonize or conquer; and their discovery had, in the sequel, about as much influence on the fortunes of mankind as the knowledge possessed by the ancients of the wonderful qualities belonging to amber and the lodestone. It slept in chronicles which civilized nations did not read, and, as Mr. Elton forcibly contends, was but the theme of a Saga, hardly more to be taken in a literal sense than the story of the Niblungs. When, 623 years later, John Cabot followed in the track of Ingolf the son of Orm, and, as Mr. Harrisse believes, made Cape Chudleigh and the promontories of Newfoundland, a like fortune attended his rediscovery of 'the Newe Isle.' Unheeded and forgotten, although it should have furnished England with the fairest of claims to North America, it was not once brought forward in the long war of piracy and adventure waged against the Spanish crown by Drake, Frobisher, Ralegh, and their comrades. The Arctic current, resembling in this the long-sought North-Western passage, has made no return worth considering, to the heroes who explored that way. It was only when the Portuguese seamen, frequenting the Canaries and the Azores, had learned the constant nature of the trade-winds; when further it had dawned upon them that these winds, though giving place to variable airs as soon as the Gambia River is passed, still blew without intermission a few leagues to westward; and when the penetrating judgment of Columbus had given to this fact the significance it deserved, that the Discovery of America was secured to the human race.

For we shall not understand the history at all, if we attribute to these men of a temperament most unlike our own that spirit of curiosity, at once scientific and disinterested, which it is natural to suppose in the first who tempted the American ocean, but to which they were assuredly strangers. The New World drew them mightily, beyond question, but they deemed it one with Asia,-the rich, magnificent, and highly civilized East, comprising many Indias, the Empires of Cathay and Mangi described in golden language by Marco Polo, and Cipango which was the palace and the garden of that distant world. If Aristotle had bequeathed to Europe the scientific idea of which America was the destined fruit, Marco Polo, and his imitator Mandeville, supplied the great imagination that served at once as a stimulus and a pledge of certain reward to the multitude. Who would have set his life upon a cast such as the voyage across these thousand leagues of ocean demanded, merely that he might disembark in frozen Labrador if he had not been lost in the Newfoundland fogs? But infinite gold and pearls and spices, the wealth of the East, might be won, so it was argued, by a little daring; and the treasures of Cathay brought to Spain untouched by the dogs of Islamites who now sat encamped between Christendom and the Golden Chersonese. Columbus did not dream that a whole continent blocked the way. He reasoned, rightly enough in the abstract, that on a sphere it was all one whether you travelled from West to East or from East to West. And when he had grasped his theory with a steadiness which almost gave him the power of vision, he added to it the practical conclusion that here was the tradewind, waiting to carry him across. But how long would the voyage last? More than a year it could not, he said to himself. And he would take a year's provision, and three vessels of a fitting size, or he would decline to attempt the discovery. In his own mind the plan lay clear and complete. He was not pursuing a phantom; the fabled isle of Antilia, or St. Brendan's Hy Brasil, or the cloudy outlines visible at certain seasons from the Canaries, had no charm for him. Others, sailing in quest of these shadowy regions, might wander aimlessly until ships and men were lost in unknown latitudes. But the very limitation of his design gave it coherency and made its success probable. He would be deluded by no Fata Morgana. In the midst of dreamers he remained wide awake; and if his motives were those of an enthusiast, the object he kept in view and the means which he took for its accomplishment show him to us as that rare exception among purblind mortals, a sublime practical genius, 'moving about in worlds not realized,' as though he beheld them.

But the discovery was not a flash of lightning. No, it came, as the Newtonian system afterwards, in consequence of many men's fruitful thinking. Even while the Middle Age was busy with abstract speculation, Albertus Magnus had restored the true notion of the Antipodes and laid down the existence of a Southern Continent, At Oxford, Roger Bacon, the true founder of inductive philosophy, had written in his 'Opus Majus' that, according to Aristotle, 'there was not much sea between the western parts of Spain and the eastern parts of India,' and that, according to Seneca, 'this ocean might be crossed in a few days with a favourable wind.' A hundred and forty years later, Pierre d'Ailly, Bishop of Cambray, repeated this significant passage of the Franciscan friar's in his 'Imago Mundi'; and the parchment-bound copy of that book which Columbus studied, and the margin of which he has covered with annotations, may still be viewed by the tourist at Seville. D'Ailly, improving on Seneca, declared that the voyage of a few days had actually been accomplished, and that 'the sea between India and Spain is a comparatively narrow strip, running north and south.' Now let us add colour to these assertions from the remarkable account which Marco Polo had given of the riches of the East. His guide-book to Asia, for such in effect it was, held the most brilliant pictures of the Great Khan's Empire, whose resources were inexhaustible, of the golden city of Quinsai, and of the wondrous archipelago of twelve thousand seven hundred isles, which Martin Behaim, the geographer of Nuremberg, describes rapturously, 'mit vil Edelgestain, Perlen, und Goltpragen, zwölferlei Spezerey und wunderlichem Volck, davon lang zu schreiben.' But, above all, it was the mysterious and alluring Cipangi which kindled dreams of wealth so vast and preternatural that the ordinary rewards of commerce faded in comparison, and no previsions could seem too extravagant to be fulfilled.

In this way, the splendid Venetian traveller became the herald of Columbus and his guide. As early as 1426, when the Infant Peter of Portugal, brother to the famous Don Henry, was staying at Venice, the Signiory made him a present of Marco Polo's volume. 'Wherever the Italian captains went,' continues our Oxford historian, 'the fame of his explorations was noised abroad;' and, in the fifteenth century, Italian captains were at the head of navigation and discovery in all the seaports of Western Europe. Under the direction of Henry the Navigator, Portuguese fleets sailed farther and farther to the south, in quest of some point where they might turn the flank of Islam at Aden and Ormuz, and thus put the Christian people in touch with the East. While, however, Venice and Genoa were seeing the last of their maritime glories, England, France, and the Spanish Peninsula, now ruled by powerful and crafty sovereigns, had risen into the rank of dominant kingdoms, from which Spain alone has since fallen. The spirit of mercantile enterprise was as strong in their subjects as that of territorial aggrandizement in the monarchs who governed them. And if Genoa, Florence, and Venice sent forth the captains that made these momentous discoveries,-for to them belonged Columbus, Vespucci, Verrazano, and John Cabot,—the spoils went not to Italy, but in the first instance to the Spaniards, and ultimately to the descendants of the Norsemen,-to that England, indeed, which was the living, though unconscious, heir of the Vikings and the Danes.

Had Carthage conquered Rome, and established on its ruins a maritime empire, it can hardly be doubted that Phœnician ships would, in due course, have explored the Atlantic. But until the naval builders of Genoa invented the carrack,—a strong and capacious, high-pooped vessel, often of three storeys,

and requiring a deep draught of water,-there existed no oceangoing craft which could undertake a voyage upon the high sea far out of sight of land, and lasting for months. In these new vessels, however, the Genoese, some of whom are found in the Portuguese service as far back as 1317, explored the coasts of Africa down to Cape Bojador, and discovered the Canaries and Madeiras. In the fifteenth century, an attempt was seriously made to colonize these islands from Portugal. And, in 1432, Gonçalo Cabral, the Portuguese, had reached even to the Azores,—so that now, we might say with truth, European discovery had got half-way to America. The slave-trade, also, was attracting expeditions all along the unhappy African coasts; and a school of hardy navigators grew up, acquainted with the tornadoes of the Bight of Benin and the crested breakers of Sierra Leone, for whom the sea had no terrors, and would soon have no secrets. In this school Columbus from a

boy received his training.

Yet we must not imagine, with Robertson, that Genoese and Venetian enterprise was subsequent to the Portuguese. On the contrary, Italian mathematicians, ship-builders, and bankers, nay Italian crews and captains, took the leading part in this 'Maritime Revolution,' as it is rightly termed. Genoa was the source of all the naval skill displayed or fostered at Seville and Cadiz. But the first America, so to speak, to which they trafficked for gold and slaves, was the African Continent, now lengthening out as they went along. The design of Columbus may be described as putting into the hands of Spain a goldbearing region, to be peopled and worked by negroes, such as Portugal enjoyed in the Western Hemisphere, and as had been confirmed to it by Pope Martin V. in the year 1442. At the critical moment came the discovery of the trade-wind, which was followed by a complete cessation of the discovery of fresh islands in the Atlantic. Was this to be the end? Columbus asked himself. And if not, could any further enterprise be undertaken, which did not contemplate a voyage distant enough to connect the 'western parts of Spain with the eastern parts of India'? Was not he called upon to make the trial?

Who first revived this great idea, and whether it was in Italy or Portugal, cannot now be determined. But the honour of doing so has been generally given to Paolo Toscanelli, the celebrated astronomer of the city of Florence. This learned man, in a discussion with Fernam Martins, a monk of Lisbon, declared that in his view by sailing due west from Portugal the land of spices would certainly be reached. Martins communicated his opinion to Alfonso V., and Alfonso, struck with the Vol. 177.-No. 353. justice justice of it, desired from Toscanelli some practical details, which the Florentine gave in his reply to Martins—a reply of which one copy in the hand of Columbus has been discovered by Mr. Harrisse at Seville. The letter, we must be careful to notice, contained no information which was not already extant in Marco Polo. With it, however, Toscanelli despatched a map-now lost-showing that the Old World occupied two-thirds of the globe's circumference, and the sea to be traversed westward one-third. At a distance of fifty degrees east of Asia was delineated the island of Zipangu, or Japan; and at the same breadth on this side of Zipangu, or thirty degrees west of Lisbon, appeared the fabulous isle of Antilia-being, in fact, pretty much in the latitude of Hispaniola. The original Latin text, given by Mr. Harrisse, is dated Florence, June 25th, 1474. Columbus, however, did not possess it until years afterwards; and greatly as he was influenced by the views which Toscanelli set forth, it is remarkable that he put aside all notion of making for the supposed Antilia which had led astray the

world before him.

Columbus had visited Iceland. He was well known in the ports of Lisbon and Bristol. He had sailed to Guinea, and had lived in Porto Santo. Tidings of the New-found Land of the Northmen can hardly have failed to reach his ears. But we should hopelessly misconstrue both his mind and his exploits, did we believe that the dreary regions of fog and mist, or even the more pleasant country of Wineland,-supposing him to have known of it,-were identified by him with the earthly Paradise which he was ever seeking. Between the Great India of Marco Polo and these lands of the Eskimo, there could be as little comparison as between Iceland and the tropics. 'There is no evidence,' says Mr. Harrisse, 'that, south of the Baltic, mariners knew or attached any importance to the voyages of the Scandinavians. The first link of the real history of the New World was forged, not by them, but by the Latin races.' If we may trust the calculations last made regarding the year of his birth, Columbus was a lad of fifteen when Toscanelli sent his letter and the accompanying map to Portugal. Six years afterwards we find him among the Portuguese mariners, and full of the great conception which was to double the size of the human world. He wrote to the Florentine, received from him copies of the epistle and the chart, made up his mind to pass by the search for Antilia and sail straight for India, and applied to Don John of Portugal in the hope that he would grasp at this magnificent prospect which was held out to him. But 'the Lord made him blind and deaf,' said Columbus afterwards, 'to the miracle about to be accomplished by the monarchs of Spain.' The truth was that Portugal, intent on the circumnavigation of Africa, believed the Indies to be already her own. Why should fresh caravels be sent on a bootless expedition? Nothing was left for the young adventurer but to give up the service of Don John, which he did in 1484, and to look for encouragement and the needful resources elsewhere. He turned to his native Genoa. But the Genoese were in no humour to complete their own ruin by diverting to an Atlantic route the trade which they were fated to lose whenever a passage round Africa should be discovered. Their interest lay in keeping to the ancient tracks of commerce, to the Mediterranean and the caravan routes. Nor was Venice, whither he also bent his steps, more likely to prosper when Genoa sank. In despair Columbus returned from the Adriatic to Lisbon; but never for an instant did he alter his plan. Science was wholly in favour of it, although the Old-World system of commerce was dead against it. He insisted then on a certain equipment: three vessels fully manned, and all the necessaries for a year's voyage. If the Italian Republics and the King of Portugal would not listen to him, there still remained England; and, were England to fail him, Castile and Arragon might come to the rescue. He despatched his brother, Bartolomeo, to London. But Bartolomeo was taken by pirates in the English Channel; and, stripped of all that he had, was fain to make his way as best he could back to Portugal. He arrived in time to join the expedition of Diaz during which the Cape of Good Hope was discovered in 1486. Next year Bartolomeo sailed once more for London, was admitted to an interview with Henry Tudor, painted an attractive chart on the lines of Toscanelli, and succeeded in persuading the King that the project was worth patronizing. Henry bade him send for his brother to England.

But the first act of the American drama was to be played on a different stage. Christopher had already travelled from Palos to Seville, and thence to Cordova. The friars of La Rabida had furnished him with letters to the Queen's confessor; and though seven years elapsed before the preliminaries were disposed of, there seems to have been as little delay as the circumstances admitted; nor have we any reason to suppose that Columbus underwent persecution at this date, or that his proposals were rejected as chimerical. Even those Churchmen who put forward Augustine's religious doubts concerning the Antipodes by way of an objection, felt for the most part, says the Curate of Los Palacios, that Columbus had the truth on his side. Not the Christians in council, but the Moors who were

S

h

n

now making their last stand at Granada, interposed a decisive hindrance to the expedition. Until these were overcome and the treasury of Castile refurnished, the means were wanting to engage in a doubtful enterprise. Yet so convinced was Queen Isabella of the advantages which might accrue from it, that she forbade Columbus to accept the aid of the Duke of Medina-Celi, in whose household he had found a place on leaving Portugal. From 1486 he was in the royal service; and it is not too much to say, with Washington Irving, that the pen which subscribed the capitulation of Granada was the very same with which Isabella commissioned the Discoverer of the New World to set sail on his ever-memorable voyage. Columbus was present when, on the 2nd day of January, 1492, the double standard of Castile and Arragon was hoisted on the towers of the Alhambra, and Boabdil el Chico, the last of the Moorish kings, passed through the gates of the city, and kissed the hands which had pulled him down into the dust. It has been often told how the plain Italian seaman demanded for himself and his heirs the great office of Lord High Admiral in the islands or mainlands he should discover, with the authority of Viceroy, and a clear tenth of all the merchandise to be gained or gotten for the Crown within his jurisdiction; how the Queen refused his terms; how he thereupon quitted Granada; how the royal messengers overtook him two leagues beyond the city, at the Bridge of Pinos, intimating that his stipulations would be accepted; and how the treaty between the sovereigns and himself was formally signed on April 17th, 1492. Nothing more was wanted than that he should hasten to Palos, secure with the friendly help of the Pinzons his three caravels, and whatever crew they could muster,—a very motley crew it proved to be, on the Admiral's showing,-and set sail during the fine season. On Friday, August 3rd, his little fleet dropped down the river with the tide half-an-hour before sunrise. Yet it was not until a month later, on September 2nd, that they arrived in the roadstead of Gomera; nor was the expedition fairly started upon its adventurous way until Sunday the 9th. Five weeks later, on October 12th, 1492, Columbus and the Pinzons were landing with the royal standard of Spain upon the island of San Salvador, which the natives called Guanahani, and which is, perhaps, the now deserted strand of Mariguana in the Bahama group.

It would be as superfluous to tell over again the incidents of that romantic voyage, as to copy out a page from Shakespere. All the world has read of them long ago; they make up, as we have said, the true Odyssey which children learn about in their story-books, and by which the feudal world of Europe, the maritime adventures stretching over three hundred years, and the immense system of modern wealth, commerce, and popular government, are all bound together. But, however true it be, as Mr. Payne contends, that the history of America lies before us in a sort of daylight, when compared with the mists of fable that hang over the more ancient world and its beginning, there remains a multitude of vexed questions on which the wisest men are unable to agree. It is certain that Columbus did not reach the continent of America until his third voyage in 1498, when he coasted along the mountainous peninsula that terminates the northern cordillera of 'little Venice,' or Venezuela, as it is now called. The native name was Paria, and the Admiral, wondering at the immense volumes of fresh water poured into the sea by the Orinoco, and misled by his readings in Mandeville, thought that here, on the eastern coast of Asia, must be the earthly Paradise. Gold and pearls he found among the natives in abundance. The land he designated Terra Firma, to mark his belief that Asia was now under his feet; and, searching still for Cathay and Mangi, he turned his vessel's prow continually to the north-west, a prisoner of the Caribbean Sea, while others, going south and east, had discovered Brazil, and were surely demonstrating that the Columbian hypothesis did not hold.

But now Mr. Harrisse throws out a question which leads one, after carefully studying his authorities, to exclaim, with the father in the old comedy, 'Multo sum incertior quam antea.' Did Columbus persist in fancying that he had reached Cathay or the Asiatic coast, when once the insularity of Cuba was determined? No, replies our historiographer. True though it be that in 1494 he had positively compelled his men to swear that Cuba was the continent of the Indies, accessible by land, and though he had himself made the same declaration before a notary public,-nay, even though, as late as 1503, he wrote to Ferdinand and Isabella, saying that he had arrived in the province of Mango, adjoining Cathay,-still, these were all politic falsehoods, and he knew, even when beholding the mouths of the mighty Orinoco and the 'infinite country' beyond, that it was a region 'hitherto unexplored,' 'de la cual fasta agora no se ha habido noticia.' Consequently it was neither Asia nor Cathay. Again, Diego Mendez, his friend and companion, bears witness that he 'navigated and went over with the Admiral much of those lands, -the coast of Terra Firma,—'in search of a strait whereby to pass from the North Sea, and that never did they find one, nor has it been found until

1

d

S

e

of

d

a

of

e.

as

in

eir

until this day.' But, argues Mr. Harrisse, if we take into our reckoning the fact that Columbus imagined this strait to be in the neighbourhood of the Isthmus of Panama, we must conclude that he no longer thought the coast of the New World identical with that of Asia. Else he would have given to Asia one east coast facing the Indian Ocean, and a second facing the Atlantic,

-which is absurd.

Furthermore,-and here Mr. Harrisse argues with the evidence of maps and plans before him, which he is good enough to share with his readers,—the notion that America was a mere prolongation of Asia ceased almost as soon as the coast of the continent had been discovered. John Cabot, in 1497, was undoubtedly the first to make that conquest of the unknown, as is proved beyond cavil by the privy purse expenses of Henry VII., and indicated by various other testimony on which we need not linger. In 1498, Cabot made a second voyage under the English flag, and coasted along what is now the shore of the United States until he reached Florida, in the neighbourhood of which there is evidence to show that he was sighted by a Spanish vessel. La Cosa, in the remarkable planisphere, finished before the year 1500, as Mr. Harrisse declares, draws an unbroken coast-line to the west of Cuba from 'the sea discovered by the English,' to the regions of Venezuela and Again, Gaspar Corte Real, the Portuguese, in a voyage during the summer and autumn of 1500, followed the eastern coast of Newfoundland, from its northern point to Cape Race. In his third and last expedition to these high latitudes, he perished with his crew, most likely about Hudson Bay. His son Miguel, who went to find him in 1502, perished likewise. But Portugal continued to send ships to the fishing banks; and Alvarez Fagundes, before 1521, had sailed round the Gulf of St. Lawrence and ranged the east coast of Nova Scotia. Nay, as far back as October 1501, 'the notion prevailed in Europe that from Circulus articus to Pollus antarticus,' -to borrow the very terms of the map,- the newly-discovered land formed a single coast-line belonging to a separate continent.' This belief also-that west of the Antilles there lay a vast independent region, stretching from north to southappears to have been shared at an early date by the Spanish monarchs. Two of the existing charts, one Spanish, the other Portuguese, of 1500-1502, set forth graphically the same conclusions. And a number of derivatives from them, which Mr. Harrisse entitles 'Lusitano-Germanic,' exhibit also a North-Western continent. But these, he subjoins, proceed from several different prototypes, and are evidently due to pilots and explorers

plorers who had sailed in those regions. For the number of expeditions was much greater than we should imagine from official records. To sum up in the words of this most painstaking author:—

'The reality of the North-Western region, and its existence apart from Cathay, or from any of the isles of the West India group, was a tenet of all the cosmographers and cartographers of Europe for thirty years after the discovery of America.'

This is surely novel and interesting. But still more so is the contention which follows, viz. that 'only in 1526 did the New World suffer an eclipse' of its identity, being combined in maps and charts from that time onward-until Mercator, that greatest of cartographists, set the world right again in 1539—with the continent of Asia, near the Line. Who, we ask with no forbidden curiosity, was the man that led his contemporaries astray, in spite of proofs daily accumulating against him, and of the very name, America, which was now in universal adoption? Peter Martyr, indeed, from the beginning, had spoken of the country reached by Columbus as 'the Indies,' and so contributed not a little to the Asian error. But it was Schöner, the mathematician of Nuremberg, who, in 1523, falling into the egregious mistake that 'there is a land called Mexico and Temistitan in Upper India, which in former times was called Quinsay,' rejected the correct opinion of Amerigo Vespucci, and united Asia and America in a single piece. Then came François le Moyne, of Antwerp, in 1526, and published the first crude mappa mundi in his 'De Orbis Situ,' where he lays down that all these countries 'are connected with each other by a continuous tract of land and an uninterrupted route, while 'America itself is joined to the eastern regions.' In the family of maps thus inaugurated, Mexico forms part of the Asiatic world, and is placed according to our learned clerk 'between Cathay and Mangi, adjoining Tamacho and Tangut.'

l

a - id - a - h

T

h

al

- : 'S Modern readers will laugh at these ridiculous gropings of the good Le Moyne, and at his maps, which prefer tradition well seasoned to experience fresh from the tropics. But nothing dies so hard as a fiction with venerable names behind it. Despite the misgivings of Columbus set down in Mr. Harrisse, and borne out by his extraordinary device of making his sailors swear that they had trodden the very coast of Asia, we may well believe that, cosmographers apart, the multitudes still fancied the New World to be simply the Old, but seen from the other side. When the Admiral reached Hispaniola, he deemed himself but a short march from the court of Cipango

and the Great Khan. By and by, Cuba, which he took for the Continent, turned out to be an island. The West Indian archipelago lay before him. Then he argued that these were some of the twelve thousand seven hundred islets described in such splendid colours by his Asiatic guides, Polo and Mandeville. The strait which he went on seeking,—why should we suppose it was really one between the northern and southern portions of an immense new territory, distinct from Asia, and not those Straits of Malacca which, as he distinctly wrote, were to bring him to the Ganges, and so to Europe by way of the Indian Ocean? At all events, from the moment he sailed north-west, this stubborn man of genius, whose renown was made by clinging tenaciously to one idea, fell out of the course and was doomed to failure. His three subsequent voyages brought him no such glory as the first had given; they would have taken from its lustre, if anything could have undone its everlasting results. And keenly as we must sympathise with the Admiral when, quitting the part of explorer and endeavouring, though by no means sagaciously, to fulfil that of Viceroy and colonizer, he was outwitted, baffled, superseded, put into chains, and sent a prisoner to Spain by Bobadilla, we cannot help recognizing in the circumstances of the case and in his own temperament the causes to which so pitiable and tragic a downfall should be ascribed. His language concerning the sovereigns who had so dealt with him was, though to some degree justified, exceedingly bitter. 'Had I seized on the Indies and given them to the Moors,' he wrote, 'I could not have been worse treated.' The last voyage he undertook in May 1502, during which he discovered Honduras, brought him only, after much fruitless toil, to the supposed land of gold known as Veragua, from which his descendants have taken their title. He was absent from Spain on this occasion two years and a half. When he returned, broken in health and spirits, he sought refuge at Valladolid, and there died, May 20th, 1506. He was buried in the monastery of St. Francis, to whom he had ever shown a deep devotion, and whose religious habit it was his delight to wear. Eight years afterwards, in 1513, his remains were taken to the monastery of Las Cuevas at Seville. Thence, in 1536, they underwent a fresh translation to the Cathedral of San Domingo. And finally, when the Spaniards ceded their portion of Hayti to France, in 1795, they were removed with solemn pomp, by the Duke of Veragua, to Havana. But the wealth and honours which he designed for his posterity did not afford them much happiness. One of the longest and most complicated lawsuits which have ever occupied the Spanish courts, arose on the extinction tinction of his legitimate male line in 1578. It was not decided until thirty years afterwards, viz. in 1608, when the Council of the Indies put in possession Don Nuñez de Portugallo, his great grandson in the female line. Thus all his inheritance and his titles passed to a branch of the House of Braganza, though established in Spain. Even unto this day there is a 'Colon, Duke of Veragua, Marquis of Jamaica, and Admiral of the Indies,' who represents the illustrious and unhappy son of Domenico, the wool-carder of Genoa. Once, with his child in his arms, he had begged a meal and a night's shelter from the friars of La Rabida. Now, what name is more certain of

immortality than his?

Many of the first American explorers have left pathetic or spirit-stirring memories, from Vasco Nuñez and Nicuesa, to Cortes and brave old Ponce de Leon. Others, like Pizarro and Magalhaens, strike us as vulgar yet bold adventurers, in whose aims there was no loftiness, and in their conduct an utter lack of principle. Amerigo Vespucci, who, by one of the oddest freaks of fortune, has given his name to a Continent at the bidding of an obscure German printer, remains, after all that has been written about himself and his voyages, a figure at once enigmatical and shadowy. Verrazzano was hanged as a pirate in Spain, nor suffered perhaps more than he would have inflicted on his captors. We know little of John Cabot, while his son Sebastian is proved to have been a time-server, and took to himself the credit of voyages upon which he never sailed and discoveries he had never made. Among this motley group, the one man to whom, with all his faults (and they were those of his age and training), the world has looked up with pride and admiration, is Christopher Columbus. He could not lay claim to vast scientific attainments, nor did he feel that untiring love of nature which has immortalized Darwin, Humboldt, and Agassiz. Moreover, the sin, hardly to be forgiven, of enslaving the Indians and bringing negroes across the Atlantic to work, where these fell down and expired in their odious captivity, must be laid at his door. Yet compare him with the rough soldier, Cortes, or with Pizarro, the brutal and unfeeling, or with Magalhaens, the runaway and the traitor, and at once it will appear that we are looking upon a hero again, a man of large heart, burning enthusiasm, inflexible will, and a mind capacious and far-seeing. His fame is not too great when we consider what things he undertook to accomplish. And, while we grant that the honours in detail of the long day's exploration must be shared among many, there is a something unique and undivided which falls to the lot of the Admiral. His vision of

the golden Indies, although he truly meant them to furnish the ransom of Christ's sepulchre, alone could have precipitated the nations of Europe upon the New World. And in that astonishing series of events which have broken the sword of Islam, subdued Asia under Christian influences, and made Europeans the conquering and civilizing race among men, Columbus has proved himself a mighty leader. Enthusiasm like his works miracles of which science reaps the fruits. Both alike, however, are guided by visions of which a faith in the ideal is at once the source and the assurance, and they differ in their

methods more than in their results.

No general ferment, says Mr. Payne, was excited in the Spanish Peninsula, much less throughout Europe, by the first news which Columbus brought with him from the lands he had discovered. And a remarkable circumstance in proof is the narrow compass within which the movement of exploration turned. The men that followed him were all his acquaintance. Vincent Pinzon of Palos had commanded the Niña; in his first voyage he carried with him Niño of Moguer; Hojeda, Juan Ponce de Leon, and the veteran pilot Juan de la Cosa, were with him in the second voyage. Diego de Lepe was of Palos again, so was Antonio de Alaminos, and Vasco Nuñez de Balboa came from Moguer. These few names fill up the story of American discoveries on the Atlantic coast, from Florida on the North to the Plate River on the South. And they remind us, too, of the day, 'a little before noon,' on which, in 1513, an untravelled ocean, wider than the Atlantic, was displayed in all the beauty of its line of light, to European knowledge. For it was not 'stout Cortez,' but that identical Vasco Nuñez de Balboa, most noble and ill-fated of the Don Quixotes sent by Spain on these heroic quests, who, in the language of Keats, ' with eagle eyes ' first

> 'stared at the Pacific,—and all his men Looked at each other with a wild surmise,— Silent, upon a peak in Darien.'

Long, however, before the year 1513, when this great event fell out, the embargo which Columbus had striven to lay upon adventurers at large had been taken off. Even in 1495 a reyal edict went forth, permitting others to explore within the bounds of his proper jurisdiction. Against that edict the Admiral protested, and it was called in. But, as we have seen from Mr. Harrisse, ever since the first tidings of the discovery, unlicensed expeditions were fitted out in Spain and Portugal, and sailed westward without intermission between the year

1493 and 1502. As many as twenty-two names inscribed on a map of the Continental coast prior to this last date, are evidence of different landings and of surveys made by various explorers, outside the closed circuit of Palos. Such unknown sailors 'continued to range the coast, and descended probably as far as Honduras at the beginning of the sixteenth century.' They had made out the east coast of North America fourteen

years before Ponce de Leon landed in Florida.

But when Columbus described the wealth of Paria, at the close of his third voyage, in 1498, his monopoly could no longer endure. One Spanish gentleman, Alonzo de Hojeda, who had served with distinction against the Moors, and whom we have already mentioned as the Admiral's companion in his previous exploring journey, fitted up an expedition to these new parts, and took with him the Biscayan pilot, Juan de la Cosa. On board there were also the mysterious Amerigo Vespucci, a Florentine formerly in the counting-house of an Italian merchant, named Berardi, at Seville, who had provisioned the second expedition of Columbus. Relying upon the chart furnished in 1501 to Ercole d'Este, Duke of Ferrara, by his Ambassador at the Court of Lisbon, Alberto Cantino,a chart which has undergone the most romantic adventures, but is extant still,-Mr. Harrisse believes that Amerigo not only had made his third voyage by that time, but was the authority for the configurations and nomenclature which the chart exhibits. Hojeda's landfall was at Surinam; he followed the level coast of Guiana, reached Trinidad,-where the Spaniards eagerly observed the naked Arawaks, of whom there is conspicuous mention in Vespucci,—crossed to Paria, sailed to Vela de Caro, and returned to Spain in the new year. They brought home little treasure, and sold the few native wretches whom they had captured in the market-place of Cadiz.

This, like the succeeding expedition of Alonzo Niño, and the many subsequent, was not in the interests of science, but of the gold and slave traffic. Where could the riches of the Indies be met with? was all the cry; and Peter Martyr had answered, 'Ad Austrum, ad Austrum, ob æquinoctii latas opes, quærentibus opes tendendum est, non ad rigentem Boream,'—the only wise plan was to turn from the North and search into the regions about or beyond the Equator. Early in December 1499, Vincent Pinzon set out with four vessels, taking the route of the Cape de Verde Islands, and standing well to the South. He thus became the first of American navigators that crossed the Line. But no sooner had he gained the Southern Hemisphere than his course failed him. Charles's Wain disappeared; the

constellation

constellation which should take its place about the South Pole he could nowhere discern; wind and tide baffled him; and his squadron, caught in the great Equatorial current and driven on by a relentless tempest, was carried to land in the eighth degree of southern latitude. He was within the line of demarcation between the Spanish and Portuguese possessions agreed on in 1494 by the Treaty of Tordesillas. But he made proclamation in the name of Castile and Arragon, and then, pursuing his course to the north-west, was the first of Europeans that sailed across the Amazon estuary. The expedition brought no wealth; but it proved that an enormous line of coast extended far to the east of the Gulf of Paria. Other Andalusian seamen went over the same track. Meanwhile, however, the third historical process of discovery, growing out of the effort to round the coasts of Africa and reach the Indies by an

Eastern sea-route, had arrived at completion.

When, in the year 1500, Pedro Alvarez Cabral was making for the East Indies on this track, not only did he drive into the Equatorial current, but a heavy gale of wind springing up detached one of his vessels from the fleet; and as he continued to sail westward, in the hope of rejoining her, to his delight and amazement he caught sight of high mountain land far ahead of him. It was the range of hills termed Pascoal, near the very spot which three months previously Pinzon had left. Cabral landed in Porto Seguro, and took possession of the country in the name of his master Emmanuel. Under the shade of a large tree, in the midst of wondering natives, mass was celebrated; a stone pillar was set up for a remembrance; and Cabral despatched Gaspar de Lemos with the tidings to Portugal, while he himself pursued his journey towards India. Thus began the second stage of American Discovery. It consisted in the slow but sure revelation of a vast Continent, stretching far below the Line, which Amerigo Vespucci perhaps for the first time recognized as a Novus Orbis, and to which, rightly or wrongly, his name was given in recompense.

Next, Roderigo de Bastidas, piloted by Juan de la Cosa, went on with the exploration westward along the torrid flats between the Gulf of Venezuela and Darien, which are interrupted only by the cloud-piercing snow-peaks of the Sierra Nevada. He skirted the vast delta of the Magdalena and the marshy shores of the Gulf of Darien, ending his cruise about ten leagues westward of San Blas. Columbus himself made out the western parts of Panama, the mountainous shores of Costa Rica and Nicaragua, and both sides of the great peninsula of Honduras. Vincent Pinzon and Juan Diaz de Solis, as was long asserted,

had

had gained some knowledge, about the time of the Discoverer's death in 1506, of Yucatan, which was still thought to be an island twelve years after, when the well-known pilot Alaminos made an attempt to sail round it. Mr. Harrisse, however, fixes the date of their expedition to 1508, while denying, documents in hand, that they visited Yucatan at all during this voyage. At any rate, the total result, down to the death of Columbus, appears to have been that the whole northern coast of Central and South America was unveiled, from the Gulf of Honduras in the West, to Cape St. Augustine in Brazil towards the East; and, at right angles to this northern coast, the eastern shores of South America, from the same cape southwards as far as the thirty-second degree of south latitude,—a coast-line

which extended altogether 7,000 miles in length.

We now come to Amerigo and his Four Voyages, on which volumes might be written, although we must despatch them in a few lines. Remarkable it is that such a cloud of uncertainty should rest upon the authorities with which we have to deal, in setting forth the origins of America. Mr. Harrisse, an involuntary but stern iconoclast, has proved that the 'Life of Columbus,' hitherto ascribed to his son Ferdinand, was written by some one else. Upon Sebastian Cabot no reliance whatever can be placed, touching his supposed voyages to the Northern Continent. There are no proofs, as again Mr. Harrisse shows, that the discovery of Chicora, set down to Ayllon or his lieutenant, was made by them; and the name of Chicora itself, with seventeen others ascribed to parts of the country, has in fact not a particle of evidence to rest upon. But Vespucci furnishes a much more complex problem than all these put together. He was not a captain, nor a pilot, neither did he cultivate the science of navigation or cosmography. Emigrating from Florence to Spain in 1493, it appears that he had been received as a clerk in Berardi's counting-house at Seville of which we have spoken, and his acknowledgment remains for the victualling of the fleet of Columbus, dated January 12th, 1496. Thenceforwards, what befel him, or whither he went, upon what voyages he sailed, and under whose command, are questions which have been fiercely debated during the last ninety years by Navarrete, Santarem, and Varnhagen, to mention no others. His own account, of which there is a Latin version, the original Italian being lost, is pretty much as follows.

He made a first voyage across the Atlantic, under the Spanish flag, which is said to have lasted from some time in May 1497 until October 1498 or 1499. On the other hand, it is certain, from Hojeda's explicit testimony, that he was on the first expe-

dition which that explorer commanded, and of which the date is the latter year, and assuredly not 1497. How came Vespucci to fall into this gross and important error, taking thereby from Columbus the credit undoubtedly belonging to him, of having been the first to reach the mainland of Paria? His second voyage, again, is said to have lasted from May 16th, 1499, to September 8th in a subsequent year not stated. And of this all the details agree with Pinzon's expedition to a southern latitude, in which the coast of Brazil was discovered. A glance at the dates given will show that they must be somehow altered or they cannot be reconciled. As for the incidents which make up the second expedition, -and Vespucci takes the honour of it to himself,-they include a landfall near Cape St. Roque in Brazil, the course continued to Cape St. Augustine, and then a cruise of 700 leagues until they arrived at the thirty-second degree of south latitude. The vessels had now been ten months at sea. Changing their course to the south-east, and boldly making for the open, they went out 500 leagues from the coast; encountered frost and foul weather; came to a barren island. which may have been one of the groups called after Tristan d'Acunha; steered again to the North; made the coast of Sierra Leone; and entered Lisbon again, on September 7th, when they had spent eleven months in the Southern Hemisphere. Two more expeditions followed, under the Portuguese flag,one of which has been identified with that of Gonzalo Coelho. assigned to June 1503, but Mr. Harrisse can furnish us out of his treasures with only six lines concerning this Gonzalo, and a thick darkness hides the different voyages from our scrutiny. The important point is that Vespucci, writing an account in Italian of what he had seen, despatched it to Pier Francesco de' Medici, then in exile at Paris, by one of whose friends it was translated into Latin, and the title, taken from a phrase in the letter itself, given it on publication, of 'Mundus Novus.' This was in 1503. The little quarto pamphlet of four pages which had been printed at Paris, was eagerly read and translated into the vulgar tongues throughout Europe. At Antwerp it came out in Flemish, and on the title-page Vespucci was described as the first of living seamen. 'From the printing presses of Augsburg, Nuremberg, Strasburg, and Leipzig,' says Mr. Payne, the story went forth in High Dutch. In the cities of Northern Italy, then the chief centres of European intelligence, it attained even a greater significance, and was looked on as the finishing stroke in the discoveries carried out by Portugal. In November 1507 there appeared at Vicenza a collection of the most famous voyages, and by the side of Di Gama and Columbus figured

figured Vespucci, who had made the expedition to the great Terra Firma. But, continues our author, 'the name of Vespucci alone appeared on the title-page, which announced the whole work as "The Countries newly found, and the New World

named from Americo Vespucci of Florence."

How had this curious event come about? Vespucci, as it would seem, on his return from the last of his voyages in June 1504, had remained in Lisbon, and there put together an account of all four, in Latin and Italian. His fame was already considerable, and we may believe, if we choose, with Mr. Payne, that 'his knowledge of the New World qualified him better than any living person except Columbus for the task of describing it.' This account he sent, with a view to his own advancement, to Ferdinand of Arragon, who was at that time in Italy. The 'Quatuor Navigationes' attained its purpose. Next year Ferdinand sent for Amerigo to Seville, where he met Columbus and was on friendly terms with him. And in 1508 he was made Chief Pilot of Spain; but he held the dignity only four years, and dying was succeeded by De Solis in 1512.

Now Vespucci, as a boy at Florence, had shared the lessons of his uncle, a friar of St. Mark's, with René, Duke of Lorraine; and meeting an Italian servant of the Duke's at Lisbon, he gave him the account already drawn up of the 'Four Voyages' for his old schoolfellow. René, it is believed, communicated the epistle to the members of a little University in Lorraine, at Saint Diey; and from that press issued, in 1507, a treatise on Cosmography to which the work of the Florentine was appended. Nay more, the printer, Martin Walzmüller (whose name is rendered Hylacomylus), made the bold suggestion that ' this fourth part of the world' should be named from its sagacious discoverer, and be called 'Amerige or America.' The book prospered; and the suggestion was repeated, as we have seen, the very same year at Vicenza. In 1509 the anonymous 'Globus Mundi' mentions 'America.' And in 1515, Schöner begins the eleventh chapter of his 'Luculent Description of the whole Earth' with the words, 'America sive Amerigen. Novus mundus, et quarta orbis pars : dicta ab ejus inventore Vesputio viro sagacis ingenii, qui eam reperit A.D. 1497.' The name was well-sounding and of the like form with 'Asia' and 'Africa.' It succeeded from the very beginning. But we must bear in mind that as yet it described only a Continent in the Southern Hemisphere, and that, until the voyage of Pineda, in 1519, the general imagination pictured to itself a chain of great islands extending from Cuba to Iceland, while South America was an island larger still and the chief of the archipelago. It

1

is true that even the map of Juan de la Cosa, in 1500, shows a continuous outline from Newfoundland to the southern Terra Firma. Many distinct voyages, however, had yet to be accomplished before the links were made clear which bound Yucatan

with Florida, and Florida with Labrador.

The settlements of Hispaniola and Darien had, from an early date, become centres of exploration. 'There soon arrived,' says Mr. Payne, 'news of a vast island discovered to the north of Espaniola, and of a great ocean visible to the south from the top of the mountainous ridge of Darien.' When Columbus died, the Gulf of Mexico was unknown. But colonists from Porto Rico were destined to reach Florida, while others from Cuba arrived in Yucatan and Mexico. We read with some deeper feeling than astonishment how Ponce de Leon, having grown old and rich by the labour of the Indians in Hayti and elsewhere, resolved on exploring the seas north of the Antilles, in search of the great island called Bimini, where was the Fountain of Perpetual Youth. He set sail with three vessels, and landed in Florida, at a point which cannot be ascertained, but in the year 1512, returning to survey the coast as far as the peninsula ran south. Not even in 1517 did Alaminos, who had discovered the Gulf Stream, perceive that Yucatan was no island. Next year, the expedition which succeeded Cordova's came into the Mexican waters, under guidance of the same pilot, but commanded by Grijalva. They had lighted upon comparatively civilized, though hostile Indians; and here for the first time they heard the natives cry out significantly, while they pointed to the west as the land of gold, 'Culba, Culba! Mexico, Mexico!' The words, however little understood, were not forgotten. And at length, when they had sailed westward of the river Tabasco, our Spanish voyagers beheld the mountains which bound the plain of Anahuac, with the enormous snowcrowned peak of Orizaba rising behind them. Two boats of the Spaniards went ashore and were received by the friendly subjects of Montezuma, whose name now first resounded in their ears as that of a mighty king. Pure gold of much value and golden statuettes were given them. Hideous idols of stone met their gaze, and tokens of recent human sacrifice. The strange, pathetic, and horrible Mexican drama, which was to culminate in the darkness of 'La Noche triste,' and in Montezuma's own death, had thus made a beginning. Grijalva went back to Cuba in October 1518. Cortes took up the part which history has assigned to him. And, by order of Francisco de Garay, Alvarez de Pineda, intending to trace the Mexican coast northwards, and if possible to find the long-sought-after Strait between

between the Oceans, did, in 1519 and 1520, complete the exploration of the inland waters, follow the coasts of Texas and Louisiana, and perhaps sail into one of the branches of the Mississippi. It remained only to establish the connexion between Florida and the 'New Land' of the Northmen and John Cabot. This was certainly accomplished by Verrazzano, the Florentine, acting under French orders, during a voyage that lasted from January 1524 until July of the same year. Verrazzano himself, as Mr. Harrisse proves, was afterwards hanged as a pirate, in November 1527, at Colmenar de Arenas. Nor did the French make any claims in consequence of his discoveries. But they had other sufficient grounds in their still more ancient expeditions to the fishing-banks of Newfoundland; while we cannot resist the evidence which Mr. Harrisse, with his extraordinary knowledge of sources direct and collateral, has brought together by way of corroborating the original story. 'When the French,' says Mr. Payne, 'had begun to enforce their claim by actual occupation, their geographers boldly wrote New France across the map of North America'; and in that Continent they long maintained their supremacy, until they were ousted by the fleets and armies of Great Britain.

But, in 1515, eight years before Verrazzano sailed from Dieppe to North Carolina, the Spanish Pilot Major, Juan de Solis, who had been associated with Pinzon in exploring the Gulf of Honduras in 1506, and the coast of Brazil in 1508, set out from Lepe on a voyage of his own, in which he discovered the immense La Plata River. In attempting to capture one of the natives 'as a specimen to take home,' he and several of his companions were slain by Indians. How far did the Continent extend? was now the question. Perhaps to the South Pole, as some conjectured. Magalhaens, however, who had long been in the Portuguese service, and knew by experience the way round the Cape of Good Hope, argued upon what we should think a doubtful analogy, that such another cape was the termination of this new Continent,-an early belief in the symmetrical arrangement of the island-worlds scattered over

the globe, which we may note in Cicero.

Magalhaens was now to fill up the great page of American discoveries. But he was no hero like Columbus. He had served Emmanuel, the Portuguese king, both as a soldier and a sailor, with abundant courage, but little reward. He asked that his payment might be increased by half a ducat per month. Emmanuel refused. Magalhaens left his service in disgust, went over to Spain, and offered Charles V. a proposal to reach the Moluccas, or Spice Islands, by the west. This,

Vol. 177.-No. 353.

he insinuated, would be equivalent to a demonstration that these wealth-producing countries lay in the Spanish portion of the globe, as defined in the Treaty of Tordesillas. In the then condition of nautical science, there were no means of either proving or disproving Magalhaens' proposition absolutely. The Emperor and his Council doubted for a space. But at length Charles yielded. On August 10th, 1519, five ships equipped and manned at the Imperial charge sailed down the river from Seville, under Magalhaens' command. He was forbidden to land in the Portuguese dominions; but was to coast along the American shores beyond the latitudes already known, and to search for the great passage or strait leading to the South Sea, and thereby to the Moluccas. On January 10th, 1520, he arrived in the Plate River, examined its neighbourhood carefully, and during two months cruised along the winding and barren coast until he came to winter-quarters in the dreary creek known as Port St. Julian. There, forty-eight years after, Francis Drake wintered, and it is a curious circumstance that Magalhaens was compelled at this very point to put down a mutiny among his followers by executing two of the captains, even as Drake executed Thomas Doughty, during his stay in the same waters. The natives, whom the Spaniards nicknamed Patagonians or Big Feet, came down to the vessels, clothed in skins and armed with bows, but no harm ensued from their meeting. On August 26th, the expedition, now beginning its second year's journey, reached the Santa Cruz River, beyond the fiftieth parallel. It was a dangerous moment. The fleet had already undergone shipwreck. But Magalhaens announced that he would pursue the coast to the very end, nor abandon it antil they had arrived at the seventy-fifth degree, and twice new-rigged the vessels. He was not required to carry out his dauntless resolution. Long afterwards, as is well known, Captain Cook penetrated into the ice-fields of the Antarctic as far as 71° 10', and Weddell, in 1823, reached 74° 15'. But two days after quitting Santa Cruz, being now in 52° south latitude, Magalhaens sighted the distant Cabo de Las Virgenes rising above long banks of sand. Before rounding it he cast anchor, and sent two of his captains to explore, directing them to return within five days. When they did so, they brought each his own story. One said it was nothing but a deep river; his companion thought it the passage they had come to seek. Magalhaens sent this man back, and he sailed up the supposed river fifty leagues, returning to announce that it was beyond question the longdreamt-of channel. But still uncertainty prevailed, which was ended only by Magalhaens swearing that if they had to eat the cow-hide cow-hide which cased their ships' yards, they should go on, complete the discovery, and satisfy the Emperor. He forbade, under pain of death, any more reference to the condition of the vessels and their stores, and made ready to enter the Strait next morning. For twenty days they followed the desolate channel, on the coasts of which no human being was visible. The length, as they judged, might be a hundred leagues. To the south, a land with scattered fires came into view, and they named it Tierra del Fuego. At last, on November 27th, Magalhaens came out into the broad waters which, when beheld from Darien, had received the designation of the Southern Sea. To him in the calm, sunshiny weather, they seemed most welcome; and he baptized them by the name, which they have ever since borne, of the Pacific Ocean. Yet, thinking that the mountainous land to the south along which he had sailed must be a fresh continent, instead of the mere island it has proved to be, Magalhaens strengthened the fiction of a Terra Australis, which lasted down to the days of Captain Cook. He himself went sailing on, until he came to the Ladrones and the Philippines. Then at Zebu, on April 27th, 1520, he was killed by a spearthrust from one of the natives who assailed his crew. And the first expedition which made the tour of the globe returned, without its captain, by the Moluccas and the Cape of Good Hope, to Spain. It arrived at San Lucar, September 6th, 1521, three years after it had set out, having accomplished a distance on the ocean of 14,000 leagues.

e

n

d

n

r

S

d

et

ed

it

ce

ut

n,

as

VO

le,

ng

Dr,

rn

on

ent

es,

vas

ide

Such was the great and tragic conclusion, by no means unworthy of its beginning, to this high romantic chapter in the world's history. Man knew at length, by actual experience, the dimensions of his dwelling-place. Henceforth, all that was required, though it is not even yet quite accomplished, was to fill up the details of which so large an outline had been given. Two thousand years before, some Greek disciple, it may be, of Pythagoras, had conceived the project of sailing from Spain to the Indies by a western route. Aristotle had shown its scientific possibility. Columbus had revived the idea in a shape at once practical and speculative. But the old centres of commerce would have none of it. The new, partly by daring and partly by stumbling, had carried out the design to which Columbus held the key, though bent on identifying the Indies with their own Antipodes. Portugal led the way along the coast of Africa, which, as we have seen, was also a sure means of entering the great Equatorial current and reaching the shores of Brazil. To Columbus, the trade-wind was an infallible guide. English and French explorers, shut out from these paths by their geographical situation and the politics of the day, ranged further north, dreamt of a passage over frozen seas to India, came into the mists and fogs and Arctic currents, and might have seemed to be debarred from the splendid prizes held out to mankind by a new continent. Much more so, indeed, when Grijalva, gazing on the snowy height of Orizaba, was taking mental possession of all that lay beneath, and when Mexico offered to the lust of Spain a golden civilization which it might appropriate and destroy at its good pleasure. Darien, likewise, had opened for its colonists an entrance into Peru, and here was a second treasure-house of the metals, gold and silver in abundance, and the mines of Potosi,—boundless wealth, if such things are wealth, to be poured into the lap of the mother-country. The dream of avarice and

dominion would now surely come to pass.

But no, it was not to be. When the chivalry and the romance of that first age had come to an end, Spain was not even one of the Great Powers. She was a wreck, -a huge whale cast ashore, waiting to be made a spoil and a prey by her enemies. The policy of colonization had failed from the outset. Soldiers trained in a crusading school against the Moors, did not understand how to turn their swords into ploughshares, or their spears into reaping-hooks. They were forced to conquer when new countries opened to them. And by the same law, they sank into the condition of the Aztecs and the Peruvians whom they had beaten down. They could lay heavy burdens upon the wretched natives and see them die, unused in their savage freedom to the yoke which civilization made for them. And, in a spirit curiously mingled of mercy and avarice, with Las Casas to show what evils the kindest-hearted of men may unwittingly bring to pass, these same hidalgos could transfer blacks from the coast of Guinea, to take up the loads that native Indians had suffered to fall from their broken backs. It was utterly in vain. Tribute, as long as the silver-mines held out, the Empire of the Indies would yield by the ship's cargo. But there never was a future awaiting it, except to be rent from Spain and delivered up, during an age of revolutions, to the half-breeds and scarcely colourable Christians, who had so triumphantly overgrown the small European bands of settlers. The Spaniards could but extend, and on much the same plan, those areas of conquest which the aborigines had already determined. They held to the Pacific coast, took little account of the forest-regions, and abandoned, with the pride and ignorance of the medieval knight-errant, those countries of the New World in which progress, civilization, and European life life in its best forms, alone were possible. Snatching at the golden reflection in the water, they lost, and well they deserved

to lose, the substance.

١.

S

tr

T

e

e

y

n

T

e,

d

ls

S.

es

's

be

ıs,

ad

of

he

ad tle

de

ies

an ife

All through Spanish America the inhabitants belonged, for the most part, to an alien race, spoke their native languages, and were never wholly reconciled to the strangers who subdued them. In a hundred years, the philosopher, studying a map of these so-called Indies, and being acquainted with the state of painful decrepitude into which Spain had fallen, might have argued with much plausibility that the day of its dominion would cease whenever a strong impulse to rebellion came from without. It did come, not on one side, but on every side. The American Revolution of 1775 was followed by the French. And within a quarter of a century, the Spanish flag was hauled down at Mexico, at Quito, and at Lima. The new republics are constantly viewed and spoken of, as though they were provinces torn from the monarchy at home, and inhabited by genuine Spaniards or their descendants. Nothing can be less like the truth. They are States peopled by aboriginal Americans, more or less tinged with foreign blood. Neither in religion nor in social training are they on the European level. They never have attained to our ideas because they share so little in the historical or racial elements which have made us what we are. Conquest having failed to exterminate them, when its pressure was shaken off, they passed by instinct into a stage of restless internecine warfare which is always congenial to the barbarian, as, for the most part, it is by the barbarian unavoidable. That is the true account of those American Republics so often quoted as an argument against certain institutions, by men of the Old World. As reasonably might we quote the example of ancient Carthage to explain the condition of modern England. Spain never had the population from which to send out swarms into Peru or Mexico. What she found she left there, after three centuries of inefficient and indolent dominion, which was never exercised on behalf of the natives, or with the slightest understanding of the laws, whether of colonial government or of political economy. Despite even the well-meant religious teaching bestowed upon them, the natives of Peru, as Mr. Payne tells us, 'still pour libations of Chicha to Pachamama, the Mother Earth; still pray to Pachacamac, the Peruvian creator; and still worship their dead ancestors.

But if Spain had the Christian faith to offer these poor heathen, certainly she had nothing else which was worth their taking. From this point of view, our Oxford writer is well warranted warranted in his affirmation that America was discovered a century too soon. Until English colonists appeared on the west of the Atlantic, we must regard the New World as simply marking time'-for who was there, among its conquerors and rulers, so much as acquainted by hearsay with the ideas and the forces now shaping the world? From the landing of Columbus in Guanahani to the landing of the Pilgrim Fathers, there was no beginning made of the American history which has since gone forward as by an internal principle of development. All the Spanish-American chapter is but a prelude to the drawing up of the curtain and the play itself. It is true that the adventurers of Elizabeth's time-and above all Sir Walter Ralegh-had secured the stage upon which that play was to be acted. And equally true it is that not the Pilgrim Fathers but Lord Baltimore, who was no Puritan, and the disciples and friends of William Penn the Quaker, introduced on the American Continent those doctrines of toleration which are now the corner-stone of civilized politics. But the great movement of advance, by means of colonization and not of conquest, is for ever linked with the voyage of the 'Mayflower.' The old, fierce Viking race, the sons of the primitive rock, men as hard as iron and pitiless in their stern strength to others, had now arrived, not in pursuit of knight-errantry but of freedom, which, though at first they kept it in their own grasp, they have, under the influence of the temper it breeds, at length consented to share with their fellows. And science has followed freedom, bringing gifts more splendid than all the golden hoards of Montezuma or all the silver mines of the mountains could have furnished. Peter Martyr was deceived when he uttered that famous cry 'Ad Austrum, ad Austrum.' The North was to grow mighty and to prevail. Spain, Portugal, and even France—the so-called Latin races—were all working towards an end which, if they could have seen it in the visions of the night, would have filled them with grief and amazement. The Indies themselves, on whose riches and abundance explorers had reckoned, were destined, like America, to become the prize of men bearing English names and carrying wherever they went English ideas. Not the language of Cervantes and Calderon, but the tongue of Shakespere, was to be the mother-speech of generations yet unborn in the New World, as in that real Terra Australis of which men cherished so curious and so false a notion. Nay, are we not constrained to add, the speech also of that immense South African Continent which Vasco di Gama sailed round on his way to the East? But here let us remark the notable circumstance which, while we enlarge upon these great and permanent conquests of the English-speaking race, will not suffer us to do so in any narrow spirit, as though desiring to exalt a nation at the expense of mankind. When we utter the word America, we do not at once think of England. English, in a true sense, America will always remain, yet with a striking

difference and peculiarities of its own.

g

o e

ie

Prs

d

rd

of

nt

of

ed

ce

rd

h,

re, ed

m,

of

ve

ras

ren

rds

of

nt.

nce

me

ing

age

ere,

orn

ich

we

uth

his

imnce

The American Revolution, lasting for quite half a century, brought to an end for ever the subordinate and merely colonial position in which the New World stood to the Old. Even where, as in Canada, it left the supremacy of the British Crown undiminished, it did not fail to create a real independence or power of self-government, to which all the conditions of a republic, so far as trade, commerce, and internal rule are concerned, have been annexed. American institutions are universally democratic and popular, unmixed with the older feudal elements which still survive in Europe, and which colour to a large extent the outward forms of our civilization. For good or for evil, these things cannot be found across the Atlantic. Freedom in its democratic shape is the basis upon which society lives and thrives. But equally taken for granted there are the methods whereby science is created or enlarged, and the religious toleration under which various confessions of faith may win or hold their disciples, without a State establishment or anything else which can distinguish them from the most indifferent and the most voluntary of private clubs. If complete political and religious freedom, with a high good fortune in carrying out scientific inventions and discoveries, be what we mean by progress, then progress is the rule of American life. And it is essentially modern. In the history of their European forefathers, Americans who have attained a certain degree of culture, take a keen but still a somewhat artificial interest. Their outlook, however, is towards the future, and they can spare but little time or attention for the past. Nor does the present condition of Europe, its politics, treaties, and standing armies, excite their interest. The effects of a McKinley tariff on trade in Vienna or South Wales come home to them far more than those which might follow upon a dissolution of the Triple Alliance. In their eyes, the States of Europe have about the same importance as had those of Greece in the eyes of a Roman when his ambassadors were dictating terms to the kings of Asia, and it had become apparent that by and by the whole civilized world would belong to him. The Mediterranean, seen from a distance of over three thousand miles, shrinks to a Dead Sea, with deserted Spain and Africa, povertystricken Italy, and half-barbarian Hellas, lying stranded around it, their part in the movement of mankind over, their charm grown chiefly artistic or antiquarian, and their influence on the Western Hemisphere absolutely null. As for the German Empire, it is landlocked, necessarily stay at home, and crushed under its military burdens. France is an anarchy; Austria is a geographical expression. The only Powers which seem to have youth left in them are colonizing England and medieval Russia. Neither of these immense monarchies can fairly be deemed the rival of America: each, as time goes on, will become more and more of a steadfast friend to her. And the new Mediterranean, where these three Powers meet, and which is no Dead Sea but alive with great and growing commercial navies, must we not discern it in the Pacific Ocean, extending as it does to the shores of India and Australia, no

less than to those of Eastern Asia?

In this most astonishing and unexpected way has the balance of the world's history been shifted from one side of the globe to the other. We cannot even fancy the series of events which should swing it back again. 'Westward the course of Empire takes its way,' cried the greatest, the most spiritual-minded of English philosophers a hundred and fifty years ago, in those verses which Mr. Payne rightly compares to the Virgilian panorama of Roman history in the Sixth Book of the Æneid. Whether 'Time's noblest offspring' shall be 'the last,' it is perhaps vain to conjecture. But that the next is preparing on American soil, who that has followed the steps of its most wonderful growth and expansion, while contrasting with them the suicidal armed truce of Europe and its degraded city populations, can think of doubting? America, which was 'a mere episode in the annals of Spain,' is now the inheritance of Europeans from every land brought suddenly beneath the influence of those modern principles of freedom, science, and complete toleration, on which we have laid stress. A new people, an utterly original race, with innate ideas most unlike those of the Europe from which they have sprung, cannot fail to be the outcome. And, starting at this epoch in human growth, how will they fare, to what will they finally attain, by what paths of suffering will they march to what new ideals? These are questions the answer to which lies far below the horizon. We see a boundless wealth of resources and apparently inexhaustible vigour with which to employ them. Europe has been created, as it now stands, by the Christian religion imperfectly conquering old superstitions, by the feudal and the monarchical systems, and by the great industries of the last hundred

hundred years. America is now in possession of a tolerant Christianity; feudalism has not touched her, and she is absorbed in trade, commerce, and business, with none of the old institutions to temper the impetuous course of these things, or to hold up a different, and perhaps a more humane, standard of living. She has not yet taken to herself so much of the literature, whether in the shape of philosophy, poetry, or science, of the Eastern world, as she may do when the fever of money-making beats with a slower pulse. Yet, apart from literature, nay, and from a sense of reverence for antiquity, to which in any case men will owe their religion, can we hope that the next act in the historical drama will be the greatest? This good, at any rate, Europe can share with her American sister, and in a more generous spirit, let us believe, than that to which the first efforts of discovery and colonization were owing. But even now we shall be justified in concluding, that if the most momentous of all events in the history of mankind was the conquest of the Greek and Roman world by Christianity, the other which marks a fresh chapter in that history and gives unexampled scope to the Christian message, was the five weeks' voyage of Columbus. No third event seems likely to rival that wild dedication of himself and his hopes to 'unpathed waters, undreamt shores,'and yet, in another sense, not wholly undreamt of, since the human instinct, pressing blindly onwards, had long overleaped the sunset and foreboded in a new world the fulfilment of that haunting vision of progress and a better time, which not all the defeats of more years than science can reckon will ever persuade man to surrender. The golden clouds which hover round the setting sun will seem, when we view them rightly, but the herald of a fresh dawn, and, in that great Providence which binds the world together and gives it a purpose, 'the evening and the morning are one day.'

ART. II.—Life and Letters of the Right Honourable Robert Lowe, Viscount Sherbrooke, G.C.B., D.C.L. With a Memoir of Sir John Coape Sherbrooke, G.C.B., sometime Governor-General of Canada. By A. Patchett Martin. 2 vols. London, 1893.

WHEN Lord Lyndhurst was importuned to leave some record of his life, he asked: 'What is there in it to make the world desire to know anything about me hereafter?' and in the same strain Robert Lowe writes: 'It never occurred to me that any one would want to know what I said, or what I did.' Why a man, so resolute in his opinions, was persuaded in this case to waive them, is explained by himself; and we may be grateful to the persistency of the friends who induced him to make even a slight sketch of a life that he found on reflection to be 'sufficiently out of the common track

to be worth recording.'

Few men of any note can nowadays escape a post-mortem examination; and provided an autobiography is written in the spirit of the one we are about to discuss, it is the pleasantest method by which we can gain an insight into character. The writer holds the mirror to his failings and his merits with an amusing candour, which is all his own. He was too straightforward to shrink from the admission of shortcomings, and he is not ashamed to say a good word for himself when he thinks he deserves it. A keen critic of others, he applies the same process to himself. Were it complete, it would be an ideal autobiography; and even the unambitious scholar who expressed a fear lest the lost books of Livy might one day be found, could indulge a regret over the missing pages of this story. The fragment which remains to us is brief for two reasons-its writer held, with Don Quixote, that 'length breeds loathing'; and having purposely cut himself off from notes, diaries, and letters, he had nothing but memory to draw upon. Those who are content with a casual glance may trace with little labour the outline of the life; while those who do not recoil from the mental effort of following out a suggestion may with this clue in their hand unravel its secrets.

Robert Lowe was born at Bingham in Nottinghamshire on December 4, 1811. His father was one of those black squires who, together with the landed gentry, carried on that form of county government which it has been thought necessary to sweep away as an anachronism. His mother was a daughter of the Rev. Reginald Pyndar, whose portrait recalls her well-known

beauty. Among her dark-haired, blue-eyed children there appeared, by some freak of nature, two albinos—Robert Lowe and a sister.

The first thing that strikes Lord Sherbrooke, as he sits down at the age of sixty-five to review his life, is the disqualification under which he entered for the race—the albinism to which he owed his personal appearance and his defective vision. He refers to the sensitiveness on the former point, which his early friends recall; but he had not happily the 'black blood' of which Tennyson complains, leading him to self-torture. It was part of the weight he would have to carry, and 'age brought the sovereign cure' of the ruddy hue, contrasting with the snowwhite hair, which, with the strong well-knit frame, made up his well-known personality. The accompanying affliction of the eyes was a different matter. He recurs to it again and again with no unmanly complaint, but with a clear perception of all that it meant. Mozley tells us that he was doing his work with one eye, and that a very bad one, but this was at the close of a long life. Robert Lowe says: 'I began life very much in the state of persons who have been couched for cataract, with the two additional disqualifications that I had only one eye to rely upon, and that had no pigmentum nigrum to protect it.

n e

e

e

S

e

1

le

i

r

e

e

Careers might have been found in which his extraordinary memory would have rendered sight a matter of secondary importance; but with a kind of wilfulness he chose the two in which his difficulty would confront him at every turn. The Bar, indeed, he abandoned, after overcoming its initial obstacles with indomitable perseverance; and it is hard to understand how a man who indulged himself in so few illusions should have chosen what he called 'the rascally trade of an advocate,' in which alertness of eye, as well as of mind, are indispensable

Those who were intimate with him will appreciate what he meant by 'never being able to indulge in the luxury of a good stare.' In the rare intervals in which his eyes were raised to a speaker's face, there was just time for the discovery that the iris was of a pale violet tint, but they were instantly withdrawn. While pleading in court, he would have missed all those intuitions which come to a skilful advocate who can take in the coup d'wil at a glance. It was a disadvantage in public speaking, which he could never overcome. 'I could not see the impression I was making on the House of Commons, and have often for want of this faculty fallen into mistakes which I could gladly and easily have avoided.'

The first glimpse we obtain of the future educational re-

former is from a parental discussion as to the possibility of teaching him anything:—

'My progress was so slow that I was eight years old before I began the great business of life—in other words, entered on the study of the Latin Grammar. So great was the difficulty I found in the beginning of my career that my mother was of opinion I was quite unfit to be sent to school, and that there was no chance for me in the open arena of life. Happily for me, my father formed a truer estimate of the case, and it was decided that the experiment should be tried. I, at least, was never troubled with any misgivings.'

After a three years' noviciate at private schools, he found himself at Winchester,—a rough ordeal for 'a boy so singular in appearance and so helpless in some respects.' He used often to entertain a dinner-table by the tale of the 130 boys struggling for a share of the milkpail at breakfast, and of the recreation he afforded to his schoolfellows: 'For the purposes of relieving the weary hours of enforced society I was invaluable. No one was so dull as to be unable to say something rather smart on my peculiarities, and my short sight offered almost complete immunity to my tormentors. This went on, as well as I can remember, for about a year and a half, and then, as even the most delightful amusements pall by repetition, it died out.' Cardwell was one of his schoolfellows, and Lord Selborne, who relates how they used to whet their brains by friendly competition in Latin verse, which was then one of the chief roads to honour at school and college.

Instead of dwelling upon his natural gift, Robert Lowe tells us—what is much more valuable—how he developed and strengthened the memory, which was one of the most striking

characteristics of his after-life :-

'It was an intolerable labour to me to look out words in a dictionary. My plan, which was almost unconsciously forced on me by necessity, was to make myself, as far as I could, thoroughly master of what I read by every means in my power. If there was a question of the meaning of a word, I could always tell the passage where it occurred in any author that I had read. I was within the limits of my reading a complete dictionary of parallel passages. Thus what I knew was all my own, and was exactly proportioned to the amount of my reading: there was no cram in it, and, if not showy, it was solid, resting upon a genuine basis—the very words of the author—and their comparison with and correction by other passages.'

The escape from the noise and imprisonment of Winchester to the peaceful 'quads' of University College was delightful, and the quondam prefect of Winchester gladly exchanged 'an odious pre-eminence

pre-eminence for a fair and just equality.' These were the palmy days of the Union Society, the name of which has never languished for want of a bard. Even a generation later its debates were declared to be equal to the best days of the British Parliament, by one of its admirers, who himself described Lord Palmerston's Bishops as 'mitred helots,' Cardinal Manning, and four men who subsequently met on the Treasury Bench-Roundell Palmer, Cardwell, Gladstone, and Lowe-were among the lights of the Society. The latter was a consistent supporter of the Liberal minority, advocating free trade, removal of all taxes on knowledge, and many other progressive measures. Mr. Gladstone, meanwhile, was the champion of Toryism and the Church. It is interesting to note that it was his spirited denunciation of Reform which so charmed Lord Lincoln, the future Duke of Newcastle, that he became a guest at Clumber, and, at a later date, the elect of the pocket borough of Newark.

The autobiography merely recalls the name of Dr. Scott in connexion with the famous Uniomachia; but Prebendary Jackson of St. Paul's, in his reprint in 1875, gives a graphic description of its origin. The idea occurred to him that the schism which had divided the ranks of the Union might be healed and good humour restored by the intervention of the Muse. While considering the matter, he says:—

'I received a visit from my college friend, then known as Sinclair of Skimmery, and since as the able Rector of St. George's, Leeds, at that time one of the most prominent and distinguished debaters of the Union. He entered heartily into the scheme, and composed many of the best lines. . . The third edition was enriched by one of the ripest alumni of the University, Mr. Scott of Balliol, now the Very Reverend the Dean of Rochester.'

who contributed the Slawkenberg notes. A specimen must suffice to prove how well the author succeeded in his attempt to recall the 'sounding march of the Iliad':—

Τοῖς μὲν νυν προμάχιζε μελάγγουνος Λοὅειδης Καὶ σφέας φωνήσας ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα. 'Τίπτε φίλοι, μένετ' ἐξόπιθεν' πολὺ βέττερον εἴη Πάντας γ' ἐξπέλλειν, οῦ φοργέττοντες ἐταίρους, Καίνην φόρμουσιν κλύββην, ἀέκοντος ἐμεῖο.'

It was during the progress of the debate that the future Archbishop Tait was fined 1l. by Robert Lowe for creating an uproar and brandishing his cap. The scholarly acumen of the Dean of Rochester in commenting on this latter incident

will be appreciated by the quondam patrons of Juggins, Randall and Slatter:—

' Ιύγγινσος. Codex S. C. L. habet v. 1 Λύγγινσος; alii legunt Ράνδαλλος. Nonnulli Σλάττηρος. Lectoris judicium esto.'

By a short extract alone we can revive the memory of the Macaronic ode in which Robert Lowe celebrated the visit to Oxford of the Duchess of Kent and the Princess Victoria. It is curious to observe how the Virgilian spirit breathes through the doggerel of the following lines:—

'Tum forte in turri, sic fama est, reading-man altâ Invigilans studiis pensum carpebat, at illum Startulat horrid uproar, evertitur inkstand, ibi omnis Effusus labor, impurus nam labitur amnis Ethica per Rhetoricque, expensive fulgida bindings, Virgiliumque etiam heroas, etiam arma, canentem.'

In company with Liddell, Scott, Gaselea, the late Bishop of London, and Lord Canning, Lowe obtained a first class in classics and a second in mathematics. He was greatly hampered in the latter pursuit by the diagrams and symbols, which were a species of torture to him. He confesses, too, an inclination, like Macaulay, to argue the point, and not accept without inquiry the dogmatic conclusions of mathematics. From University College he migrated, as a Fellow, to Magdalen, over which Dr. Routh was presiding, 'a scholar and gentleman whose reign began in the time of Louis XVI.' That charming retreat, however, proved no Capua to Lowe. He resigned his Fellowship, married, and took pupils for ten hours a day, devoting his hour of recreation to reading Sanskrit. He must needs, too, harry the respectable 'clerical gerontocracy' which presided with much dignity in hall and common room. Nor did his views commend themselves to the undergraduate mind, who regarded his standard as Master of the Schools as needlessly exacting. Perhaps they were right, since some of those whom he plucked proved good enough for legislators in after-He could not bring himself to believe that even a 'pass' may be an arduous feat to some minds, and had no sympathy with the ballad of 'Augustus Smalls of Boniface,' which relates :-

> 'How many a livelong night he read With sported oak and towelled head To get him his degree,'

Worse, too, it was felt that while sheltering under the kindly wing of Alma Mater, he was meditating those godless innovations

He

vations which brought the staid Warden of All Souls to

his grave.

In due time, however, the young reformer left Oxford to the troubled repose which preluded the storm he had helped to raise; and quitting the little house at Folly Bridge where he had lived since his marriage, he transferred himself to the Temple. Shortly after we find him advising his brother Henry Sherbrooke, as to the Bar. 'The way of life which I should pursue, is to read about seven hours a day, which I consider enough for a Chancellor,' and never to dine in hall if he valued his digestion. And again, 'If you mean to read Law, you must not do it by halves, for it is a very repulsive study.' We pass over the interlude of his candidature for the Greek Chair in the University of Glasgow with the remark that, in preferring the claims of Mr. Lushington, the University lost one ideal professor and gained another, of whom his rival wrote the following generous tribute:—

'I must admit that I believe Mr. Lushington to have been a better scholar than myself, and am happy to record that after thirty-two years of most excellent service he has retired, carrying with him the respect and regard of the whole University.'

In speaking of a Pre-lectorship of Logic which would at one time have satisfied his ambition, Mr. Lowe says:—

'A Pre-lectorship of Logic had just been created, and I really think, if I had obtained it, I should very probably have shrunk from the plunge into the great world which I was about to make. Happily I did not get it, and so the plunge was made.'

We have here a testimony to the truth of the remark he made many years later, as to the difficulty with which he had been

dragged from his books.

The ill-advised idea of reading for the Law reminds us of the reply of the father who—inquiring his son's view as to a profession—was told, 'I intend, sir, to follow the law.' 'You may follow the law, sir, but I am d—d if you will ever catch it.' The dreary drudgery was, however, entered on. The following passage gives an idea of the antipathy with which he regarded his self-imposed task:—

'When I came to the mysteries of special pleading, I stood aghast at its mingled iniquity and absurdity. It will probably escape the reprobation which it so signally merits from posterity because no human being will be found willing to learn it for the purpose merely of knowing to what monstrous folly and iniquity, custom, tradition, and the pride of knowing something extremely difficult will reconcile really able and honest men.'

He was called to the Bar in January 1842; and then received the verdict of three celebrated oculists that he would be blind in seven years—a verdict which he records in the pathetic words:—

'It is not very difficult to imagine the bitterness of such a revelation: to be told at eight-and-twenty that I had only seven more years of sight, and to think of the long night that lay beyond it was bad enough; but the reflection that the object which I had struggled through a thousand difficulties with such intense labour to attain was lost to me, was almost as bitter.'

He did not, however, like Hadrian, kill himself to spite the doctors; but in obedience to their advice sailed for Sydney on

8th June, 1842.

Robert Lowe reached Sydney in October 1842, after a four months' voyage. Sir Emerson Tennant says that a ship is 'an object of interest to every one except those on board.' If any one could lend dignity or interest to the record of a voyage, it would be Washington Irving in his Astoria, where he relates the trials of Captain Thorn with his unruly passengers and his endeavours to 'clear them out of the lubber holes.' A financial panic was in progress when Mr. and Mrs. Lowe arrived at Melbourne, which reminds one that there is one now, and will be many more before the Europe of the Pacific has attained its full stature. Those who look askance at 'unearned increment' are reminded that there is also an 'unearned decrement.' But there is a recuperative power in young constitutions denied to older; and what we now see is but

'The baby figure of the giant mass to come.'

People whose imagination cannot help them have the aid of experience, and can see the five million people, which the United States boasted at the beginning of the century, now multiplied by twelve. We think, however, the 'Semitic gentleman' who told Mr. Patchett Martin that the land which his father threw away in Melbourne was at that moment worth 1000l. per foot, must have allowed his chagrin to get the better of his facts. What would the City say to 1000l. per foot?

Those who have had the good fortune to enter the Bay of Naples, as the first beams of sunlight were awaking its storied shores from Misenum to the Islands of the Sirens, or have seen Rio de Janeiro, sleeping on its lovely bay, beneath the shadow of Corcovado, may compare their impressions of its rivals with the description which Mrs. Lowe gives of the first view of

Sydney :-

'The vessel, every sail spread, suddenly wheeled round an immense barren rock, and there was Port Jackson, lying in beauty not to be described or imagined, before us. We were close to land-I could almost have dropped a stone upon it. Bays, promontories, almost in fantastic confusion, on every side; rocks, trees, thrown in every exquisite form together; houses, cottages of white stone, some halfhid in trees, others on rocks in every bay and on every promontory, The bay is immense, like a large lake bounded on every side by rocks, which look as if they had been formed for beauty alone; and Nature has adorned them, with the most exquisite taste, with trees, some of strange leaf and form, but wonderful in beauty; here and there trees of golden yellow; the rock white stone, stained with rich red and brown, strange and fantastic species of (I suppose) cypress-trees and lignum vitæ, and bright and lovely flowers. We tacked first to one side of this wonderful spot, then to the other, until my rapture rose almost into a delirium of delight. Again we turned a spot with a sudden whirl, and there was Sydney, and fine shipping before it—Sydney, built on a rock promontory of white stone, the new Government House, superb, of stone, one side, and through a deep vista formed by promontories fading into distance the Paramatta river opens. I must describe with my pencil if I can; I cannot with my pen.'

It was among such scenes that Robert Lowe landed—scenes which impressed him deeply; showing how keenly alive he was, with all his disadvantages, to natural beauty:—

'There is a district fifty miles south of Sydney called Illawarra, which seemed to me to be the nearest approach to a terrestrial paradise. The glorious sea-coast, with caverns which flung up their spray far inland, the enormous trees on the top of which the bellbird fluted its notes into the air, the lovely flowers and the profusion of animals in all their strange varieties, made of this delicious district a fairyland, the very place where a man might pass his time with no other regret than that of being totally useless.'

But amid these enchanting surroundings quickly arose the aliquid amari—gloomy forebodings as to his sight, and shortly a total prohibition to work. It was then that his fortunes reached their lowest ebb. At length, wearying of inaction, he discarded the oculists' advice and began to read. He found more elbow room than he had done at home, and quickly made his way, though hard times 'had dried up the sources of litigation.'

The first case which brought him into notice was his defence of the murderer Knatchbull, whose crime has become so encrusted with fable, that the biographer has essayed the task of laying bear the facts. There is too much 'wormy circumstance' in this part of the narrative to suit our taste. There is

s

1

11

8

it

0

)f

w

e-

h

of

d

n

w

of

he

not even that mystery which invests some murders with an evil fascination. It was in fact a coarse crime, which must have appeared singularly lacking in artistic finish by the many experts who were then to be found in Sydney. The defence was considered a masterpiece of forensic skill. The advocate did not indeed attempt to disprove the deed, while, like Philipps, he held a confession in his pocket. But, basing his arguments on an analysis of the prisoner's brain, he set up the plea that he had acted under 'an invincible and unavoidable necessity.' We confess to a leaning towards the plain words in which Judge Burton swept away these metaphysical subtleties. The doctrine that a man is not to be held accountable, because he has been 'impelled by an overpowering internal impulse,' is one which would lead us on a longer journey than it is profitable to take. In times when a self-evicted tenant is a martyr and the man who is executed for taking his place is a criminal, it is well to see that our philanthropy is reserved for the proper object. Messieurs les assassins can at any time abolish capital punishment, and we must be content to await their initiative. Perhaps the advocate was not greatly impressed by his own argument; for when refuting a charge of impiety which had been based on his speech, he said: 'There are many things in the report I never said, but I am in the habit of attaching so little weight to what falls from counsel in argument, that I should have thought it ridiculous egotism to meddle with it.

It was not long, however, before Robert Lowe became immersed in politics-his future career. His first entry was due to his friend Sir George Gipps, who appointed him Crown member for Sydney. The character of this high-minded Governor is briefly depicted in the words, 'Sir George Gipps is notoriously a man who has never even stretched a point for a private friend.' But the new member was the last man to accept a mandate. The Governor found that he had nominated a Balaam, who more frequently opposed than supported him. The early days of the United States Assembly produced some striking orators. So, too, did the Legislative Council of Sydney, and the nominee of Sir George Gipps found no unworthy compeers in such men as Windeyer, Cowper, Lang, and Went-The latter, commenting on Lowe's maiden speech, acknowledged that 'the efforts of the hon, member, smelling of the lamp as they did and highly considered as they were, were nevertheless efforts of no small merit.' There was no lack of eloquence, as we have said, but its exuberance was held in check by the duel-a practice which lingered on during the il

ve

y

ce

te

se

is

he

le

ds le-

le,

an is

sa

for

me

eir

by

ich

ny

of

gu-

dle

m-

lue

wn

ded

pps

or a

to

ted

im.

me

iey,

thy

ent-

ech,

ell-

hey

was

was

ring

the

the whole of Robert Lowe's stay. He was peculiarly obnoxious to this method of attack. An account of one of these affairs is given by Mr. Bloxsome, who, when a boy, in company with his father rowed Lowe across the harbour of Sydney to fight a duel with Mr. Broadhurst, a barrister. 'I well remember,' runs the account, 'hearing my father say that Mr. Lowe said to him as we were pulling them over in the boat: "They think because I can't see that I can't fight; but they will find that they are mistaken." He waited, with his second, Captain O'Connell, till 10 o'clock at night, but his antagonist did not appear:—

'Lord Chatham with his sword drawn
Stood waiting for Sir Richard Strachan;
Sir Richard, longing to be at him,
Stood waiting for the Earl of Chatham,'

The Member for Sydney continued to vex the Governor's soul for about a year, and then resigned. In commenting on this period, he said, 'I was in this position—if I voted with the Government, I was taunted with being a slave; if I voted against them, I was taunted with being a traitor.' It was while sitting as a representative member that he took an active part in the severance from New South Wales of what was then the outlying district of Port Phillip, and the creation of the Colony of Victoria. We pass by, as founded on faulty analogy, the allegation of Sir Charles Gavan Duffy and others, that this action implies sympathy with Irish Home Rule. But what is more interesting to note is that his speech foreshadows that Imperial Federation which, after nearly half a century, is emerging from the gloom which surrounds us—the brightest hope of the future:—

'As a general rule, the interests of the Colonies are not consulted by frittering them away into minute particles, but by combining as large a territory into a single State as could be effectually controlled by a single Government. I cordially agree in the abstract truth of the motto prefixed to the article in the newspaper of this morning, that "Union is strength," and I would extend that principle to the whole Colonial Empire of Great Britain. I hold and believe that the time is not remote when Great Britain will give up the idea of treating the dependencies of the Crown as children, to be cast adrift by their parent as soon as they arrive at manhood, and substitute for it the far wiser and nobler policy of knitting herself and her Colonies into one mighty Confederacy, girdling the earth in its whole circumference, and confident against the world in arts and arms.'

If we are compelled to omit all reference to much on which the biographer, from his connexion with Australia, is tempted to dilate, it is from no lack of interest in the subject, and with a full recognition of the fact that though the future may be to the English-speaking race, it will not necessarily be to England.

The main resultants of Lowe's labours in Australia were-(1) the system of self-government which now obtains throughout Australia, Tasmania, and New Zealand; (2) the cessation of criminal transportation to New South Wales; (3) the creation of the Colony of Victoria; (4) the establishment of the prevailing system of National unsectarian education; (5) the settlement of the people on the public lands and the growth of

a genuine yeoman class.

The question of education may be better dealt with at a later period; and to the Colony of Vietoria we have already Robert Lowe had quickly found a new seat as a representative member, and became one of the most powerful opponents of the 'Government by despatches,' which the Attorney-General of Victoria, following the stream up to its source, unceremoniously described as the autocracy of a 'clerk named Rogers'-the late Lord Blachford. The Australians were already beginning to require some other qualifications in their rulers than a general knowledge of 'where these places are on the map'; and in the columns of the Atlas newspaper which he had founded, Robert Lowe plied his enemies of the Colonial Office, and their mouthpiece Sir George Gipps, with a wealth of invective which showed that the climate of his new home had not impaired his powers. Since a warning for the future may be gathered from a retrospect of the past, it may be worth while to give his views as expounded in the Atlas in 1845 :-

'There are forty colonies belonging to Great Britain all more or less misgoverned.' After this somewhat sweeping statement, he traces the fate of the Australian despatches from their receipt by the Downing Street clerk-part he pigeon-holes, part he forwards to Mr. Secretary Stephen; a very few he submits to

Lord Stanley. He then

' crams his Lordship, in which process the most ample scope for false colouring is afforded. Thus the Under-Secretary may be, and frequently is, made the tool of his clerk, and the Principal Secretary,

the tool of his Under-Secretary.

'Is not the result such as might naturally be expected from such a system? That the Secretary knows nothing about us, except as much cram as may be necessary to make a speech to an inattentive assembly a shade more ignorant than himself; that the Under-Secretary knows just enough of us to adopt some crude and impracticable theory, to which he adheres with the desperate tenacity of ignorance and presumption; and that the clerk, our real governor, who is utterly unknown unknown and irresponsible—who will not be praised if we are governed well, nor blamed if we are governed ill—should take it as easy as possible, and content himself with echoing back the despatches he receives, sometimes enlivening the matter by an occasional abuse of the Governor for something perfectly right, just to show he has an opinion of his own.

1.

rt

of

n e-

e

of

ly

aul

he

ts

rk

ns

in

es

er

of

or

ay

las

оте

nt,

ipt

he

lse

fre-

ry,

ha

uch

bly

ows

, to

pre-

erly

With the recollection of Boston harbour floating with tea, and of many a churlish rebuff to our Colonists, we may trust that a better era has at length dawned. The colloquy between Lord Stanley and Mr. Cardwell in Downing Street gives a humorous sketch of bygone times:—

'Lord Stanley. You have doubtless heard That New South Wales has got a Constitution: Such an Assembly, I should think, was never Seen since the time of Romulus—all thieves—Several who have not yet received their pardons; And Stephen says they voted it a breach Of privilege to pick a Member's pocket While in debate engaged. 'Tis sad to think The spurious Liberalism of the age Should give such rascals power.

Mr. Cardwell. Sad indeed!'

The Atlas was conducted with much ability and certainly with no lack of spirit. Remembering the times, we should have imagined that a 'lighting Editor' would have been necessary, with funeral expenses and pension for his widow guaranteed, as in the early days of United States' journalism. Among the staff were many who rose to honour—Sir James Martin, Sir Archibald Michie, Mr. Foster, subsequently Premier of New South Wales, and among the aspiring poets appeared the unknown signature of 'H. Parkes'—then a toyseller in Sydney, and since that time the most prominent person in his adopted country.

How quickly a land question may spring up in a new community may be gathered from the attitude of the early squatters and the long campaign which Robert Lowe waged against his former friends and the Colonial Office under Lord Grey. It was the struggle to produce that class of yeomen which are the backbone of a State. How far the shoddy article we are trying to produce will take the place of what our legislation has swept away, is a subject on which doubt may reasonably be entertained.

The share he had taken in putting an end to transportation was a point to which Lord Sherbrooke reverted in his last years with unmixed satisfaction. The difficulty of the task may be inferred from his oft-expressed opinion that he ought to have

been hanged for his seditious conduct. Mr. Gladstone had now come on the stage as Colonial Secretary, and it is amusing to note the comment with which Mr. Lowe's paper heralded his advent: 'He is, we believe, an amiable and kind-hearted man, whose only failing is said to be a leaning towards the foolish and degrading doctrines of Puseyism.'

Transportation had been in vogue since the time of James I., when 'dissolute persons' were 'exiled' to Virginia; and the Judges were authorized either to execute or to transport the moss troopers of Cumberland, but the Committee of Sir William

Molesworth in 1838 reported against its continuance.

It was during this struggle that Robert Lowe played the unaccustomed rôle of 'agitator.' His sanguine anticipations of the new Colonial Secretary were rudely dispelled by despatches from Mr. Gladstone. After laying down the general principle that a new State should be founded by the 'most vigorous, intelligent, and hardy classes of the mother country,' he proceeds to argue that they are not applicable to the present case. In his despatch to Lord Charles Fitzroy of 30th April, 1846, Mr. Gladstone characteristically explains the situation. After remarking that 'Her Majesty's Government sympathises with the impatience of the Colonists of New South Wales, at receiving convicts,' he proceeds:—

'The labour of such persons would be more liberally remunerated in Port Phillip than in Van Diemen's Land. They would be much more thinly dispersed among the population, would form a scarcely perceptible element in the composition of society, and would enjoy those favourable opportunities of improving habits and character, which transportation, according to its first theory, was designed to afford; and if this disposal of them, during the latter portion of their respective terms, should follow upon a period of really efficient discipline in the probation gangs (which as yet I by no means despair of their being made to yield) during the earlier portion, in such cases I conceive, while the economical benefit to Port Phillip would be great, the hazard from which such an immigration can never perhaps entirely be set free, would be reduced to its minimum, and the hopes of the ultimate reformation of the convicts proportionally raised.'

Further convicts were to be sent direct from England to be engaged on public works, 'always presuming that they are neither destructive to health nor essentially liable to moral objections.' We can well understand that the convicts might be 'destructive to health,' or even to life; but whether it is the public works or the criminals that are liable to 'moral objections' is not equally clear. The 'impatience of the Colonists' found vent in the threat that if England persisted in her policy.

policy, Australia would in return ship her own criminals to England. Mr. Gladstone on this decided to erect Northern Australia into a Penal Settlement, and despatched the Lord Auchland, conveying the new Governor, Colonel Barney, and a guard of twenty soldiers. Robert Lowe depicted the happy life of the new Alsatia:—

'Where thieves shall work at trades with none to buy, And stores unguarded pass unrified by, Strong in their new-found rectitude of soul, Tamed without law and good without control.'

Lord Grey, however, at this point succeeded to the Colonial

Office and promptly suppressed the new settlement.

g

d

le .

.,

e

ie

m

1e

18

S-

al

st

y,

nt

il,

n.

es

at

ed

ch

ely

oy

er,

to

eir

ci-

of

868

be

pes pes

be

are

ral

the

ec-

ts '

her

cy,

It was the subsequent reversal of this decision by Lord Grey which raised a storm of indignation and gave rise to the dramatic scene enacted on the Circular Quay of Sydney, which brought its actors into measurable distance of the hangman's rope. When the long-looked-for Hashemy, with her cargo of convicts, appeared in the offing, the people turned out en masse, and under the leadership of their Tribune gave that forcible expression of their views which settled the question of transportation. The following extract from Robert Lowe's speech bears out his estimate of the day's proceedings:—

'The threat of degradation has been fulfilled. The stately presence of our city, the beautiful waters of our harbour, are this day again polluted with the presence of that floating hell—a convict ship. In the port lies a ship freighted, not with the comforts of life, not with the luxuries of civilized nations, not with the commodities of commerce in exchange for our produce, but with the moral degradation of a community—the picked and selected criminals of Great Britain—educated in her crowded streets, among her starving masses. New South Wales must be the university at which these scholars in vice and iniquity must finish their course of instruction. New South Wales must alone supply the college where these doctors in crime can take their last degrees.'

The enthusiasm which greeted his words may be gathered from the cry of an old woman in the crowd, 'Ah! bless his dear old white head!' He was followed by a young artisan, Mr. Henry Parkes, who, as a working man, indignantly asserted the rights of the people. But the matter did not rest here:—

'To strike, not please, his utmost force he bends.'

A tumultuous crowd overawed Sir Charles Fitzroy in the Government House. And before the proceedings terminated Robert Lowe moved a resolution affirming the necessity of responsible responsible government, and urged that Her Majesty should be petitioned to dismiss Earl Grey from her Council:—

> 'Aude aliquid brevibus Gyaris, et carcere dignum Si vis esse aliquis.'

The notable year 1848 found Mr. Lowe elected as the people's member for Sydney. Mr. Henry Parkes and his friends put forward a curiously progressive handbill in support of their candidate. An explanatory pamphlet, published at the same time, shows among its contents 'Robert Lowe, the present idol of the people.' There is an unconscious irony in the word 'present' which probably escaped the writer's notice. Here are the views of his supporters:—

' To the Electors of Sydney.

'Gentlemen,—The glory of a new era in the political history of New South Wales is ours. The victory we have gained to-day—of principle over prejudice, of justice and the people's rights over class interests and the intrigues of faction—is a triumph which will be hailed by freemen with exultation throughout the Australian colonies and on the shores of our Fatherland. Who shall say now that the citizens of Sydney are behind in the work of political progression? Our captains of a former day halted in the march; but we have chosen a greater man for our leader, and our watchword is, "Onward to national freedom and happiness!"

The address bears the name of Henry Parkes as one of its signatories, and represents Robert Lowe- victorious through the might that slumbers in the peasant's arm'-in a somewhat novel light. The attitude taken up by the Member for Sydney in such palpable contradiction to his future course was due to his conviction that 'the petty aristocracy' of the then Colony was unequal to the task of confronting the problems which lay before it—that free immigration of untainted labour could alone stifle the 'rotten seed' with which the land had been sown, and that the goal to which they must press forward was responsible government and 'the power of expending their own money and making their own laws.' It was not long before Mr. Lowe found means to dissipate his new-found popularity by one of those curt well-reasoned letters which are about as pleasant handling as a hedgehog. The following is his reply to a deputation of his 'unemployed constituents,' who wanted assistance : -

Because the revenue (which is principally raised from the wages

^{&#}x27;SIR,—I must beg to decline to attend your meeting for the following reasons:—

of the people) ought to be expended for the good of all, and not of a particular class.

Because it is just as improper to spend public money to keep up

wages as to keep up rants or profits.

d

d

18

8

e

?

d

s

h

t

y

0

y

y

e

d

1-

y

e

f

nt

d

V-

of

Because I do not think the mechanics of Sydney ought to put themselves in the position of paupers receiving charitable relief at the expense of their equally distressed fellow-colonists.

'Because those who anticipated an immediate profit from the intended expenditure are the worst possible judges of its necessity.

'Because the attempt to prevent labour finding its level must, in

my opinion, be either useless or mischievous.

'Because I will never be a party to spending public money in order artificially to raise the price which employers of mechanics in the interior must pay for their services, and thus to arrest the progress of improvement throughout the colony.

'I have stated my reasons thus at large out of respect to the meeting, with whose wishes I regret it is not in my power to concur.

'And I remain, Sir, your obedient Servant,

' ROBERT LOWE.

Sydney, December 19, 1848.

The people declared that 'every syllable grated on the ear,' and promptly cast down their idol. When Pombal was told that the mob was pulling down his statue, he consoled himself with the reflection that it was never a very good likeness, and possibly the Member for Sydney may have thought that the portrait which his friends had drawn of him was not sufficiently true to nature to command very long approval.

Robert Lowe and his wife returned to England after an absence of eight years, and it was not long before he entered the arena of politics—the path which he had at last marked out for himself. He found such contemporaries as Gladstone and Cardwell far advanced on the road; but if his absence from home had delayed his start, the time had not been thrown away. He had passed through his parliamentary noviciate, and his fame had preceded him. His independent action had not ingratiated him with the Colonial Office; nor had the light which he had flashed upon various home celebrities, from time to time, been much to their liking. But fear as well as favour is a passport to office, and it was felt that he was a man who could not safely be left in opposition.

He was elected for Kidderminster under the auspices of Lord Ward; and it was on this occasion that his supporter Canon Melville remarked of their new member that he would go straight into office, and he could not predict when he would come out again. It argues some utility in such boroughs as Gatton and the like, that Kidderminster, and his subsequent return for Calne by Lord Lansdowne, should have provided

seats without cost or trouble for a man of his stamp,

It was in the pre-Reform epoch, while Mr. Lowe held subordinate but not therefore unimportant office, that his most valuable work in constructive statesmanship was performed. (1) The India Act, 1853; (2) The Law of Limited Liability; (3) Education, and (4) Sanitation, involved much unobtrusive work, which received little recognition by the general public, but have left their mark on our national life. Before we enter upon their consideration, we may glance at their author in

another aspect.

Robert Lowe had not long made his debût in London society before he obtained the hall-mark of a wit, in becoming by general consent one of the pegs on which a stray joke may be safely hung. If he had lived a generation earlier, his bon mots would have travelled round in their appointed orbit from club house to assembly, and from assembly to Spa. But the old régime was waning when he entered the London world, and the salon of Lady Palmerston was one of the last to assert itself against the tendencies of the new era. The fathering of a witticism was always a difficult task; but, in the ever-widening circle which the last half-century has seen, has become wellnigh impossible. Those who have attempted a collection of bon mots find that, like the old masters brought together at a loan collection, there are many 'originals'; and that the same jest has been served up in many different languages. The accredited wit has some of his property filched from him, but he obtains more than an equivalent—not, however, always to his liking. Bishop Wilberforce was not inclined to be overfastidious, but even he must have been scandalized by the unepiscopal flavour of some of his reputed sayings. Robert Lowe became the recognized mouthpiece of sardonic humour, and thereby obtained more than his share of questionable notoriety. Many of his imputed stories are obviously adaptations. A former friend who met him in London is said to have accosted him with the remark, 'Don't you remember me? I used to know you in Australia,' and to have met with the rebuff, 'Yes, and when I meet you again in Australia I shall be happy to know you.' But this is a mere echo of George Selwyn's remark under like circumstances: 'I shall be pleased to renew our acquaintance when we meet again in Bath.'

Mr. Lowe might fairly have considered that his fame in this department needed little assistance. Yet so keen was his appreciation of a good thing that, provided it satisfied his fastidious taste, he was careless as to the effect it might have on

his credit. But if he was indifferent on this point, neither was he jealous to guard his own property. 'The subjects of political wit are, in their very nature, fugitive and evanescent,' and many a saying now lost or worthless from being stripped of its context bore the impress of his mind. Horace took good care that no needy umbra should carry his choice morsel to Mæcenas, but many of Lowe's best things were dropped quietly in conversation to any chance hearer. Though his presence was held to guarantee a successful dinner-party; he had none of the affectation of a professional raconteur. He says that he never found his chief pleasure in society, yet he reminds us naïvely that he had some gifts for it:—

'Nature, though in many respects a hard stepmother, had, I may say without vanity, bestowed on me some power of conversation. My dear and lamented friend, Sir George Lewis, used to say that, if he were to be cast away on a desert island, I was the associate whom he would choose. And I have been told that Sir Alexander Cockburn said that I was the companion he would choose on a wet day in a country house.'

The same opinion was entertained by his friend 'bear' Ellice, whose undoubted yet apparently unsought influence over the political leaders of his day was a problem to all who knew him.

of the state of th

, okr sss

n

To say that Robert Lowe was not brilliantly original would be to contradict facts; but the charm of his conversation was mainly due to the flood of light with which he could illumine every topic as it arose. He is reported to have said that to ask Mr. Gladstone a question was like pulling the string of a shower bath, but to engage Robert Lowe in conversation was like liberating the waters of a fountain to sparkle in iridescent hues. He had such a store of apophthegms and witty sayings that, like the poet Rogers, he often used the phrases of others when his own would have been equally effective. He culled his flowers from many a garden, but he had too tender a love for a joke to 'assassinate' it by misquotation. When he met some congenial spirit, the flood of epigram and illustration would at times arrest the talk of a table, but he avoided the grave error of absorbing conversation. He had, too, the merit of being a good listener. He was no respecter of persons, and to those from whom anything could be learnt he showed a deferential attention, which was embarrassing till it was found to be perfectly natural. Like every other person of taste, he had a great liking for the conversation of cultivated women. There was an Attie flavour about his talk which delighted even those who were ignorant of the ingredients of which it was composed. He had, too, the art of imparting knowledge without offence; and while a person of Brougham's disposition left his hearers dazed and humiliated, those who engaged in conversation with Robert Lowe quitted his society with a sense of surprised pleasure at having been able to contribute so much to the general fund. But work, not play, was the business of his life.

Whenever he was quiet he was at work; and when he broke silence, it was to deliver some trenchant speech, which, though it delighted his friends and confounded his opponents, did not always contribute to the success of the cause he had at heart. It was a saying of his that, 'though all Ministers were ignorant of their business, he differed from them in this—that he took the trouble to learn his.' To have obtained complete grasp of a mass of elaborate and novel details would argue industry in any one, but is well-nigh incredible in the case of a man who for more than fifty years was incapable of reading by candle-light.

It was in June 1853, in Lord Aberdeen's Ministry, that Sir Charles Wood introduced the Government of India Bill in a speech of 'unexampled prolixity and dulness,' which substituted competition for nomination in the Civil Service, and paved the way for the abolition of the dual control and the extinction of the East India Company. Any dulness there might have been in the chief was amply compensated by Lowe, the Secretary of the India Board, who, commenting on Lord Stanley's fear that the Government would secure the services of none but 'pedants and schoolmasters,' remarked that the noble Lord had argued the cause of ignorance so persuasively that, 'were he ignorant, he would only wish to listen to such a teacher.' We trust the competition wallahs may never be subjected to such an ordeal; but if so, we shall be content if they prove themselves equal to the heroes trained under the old system, who saved India in the Mutiny. Great was the perturbation of John Stuart Mill, when his fellow-philosopher and economist laid ruthless hands on the venerable Log Company. And Albany Fonblanque, the motto of whose life was-

'ridentem dicere verum Quid vetat?'—

asked: 'If the Court of Directors has on the whole done so much better than the Imperial Parliament, why not transfer to the former the small addition of the management of the United Kingdom, with its dependencies? Thirty million would not be much of an addition.'

It may be assumed that Lowe was not a persona grata to a man of the world like Lord Palmerston, who, though capable of

any exertion when a burning question had been fanned into flame, was a firm believer in Lord Melbourne's 'Can't you let it alone?'

It was not, therefore, till after many shiftings of the pawns on his political chessboard that he admitted Lowe as Vice-President of the Board of Trade. It was in this capacity and with the able assistance of Lord Bramwell, Sir Thomas Farrer, and Lord Thring, that he carried the Joint Stock Companies Act of 1856 and 1857, which has so profoundly revolutionized our commercial life. During its passage, Lord Campbell's advice was asked. His answer was: 'If you give notice, it is all right. If not, it is a d-d swindle.' Hence arose the title Limited Company. During the debate Lowe referred to the numerous letters which had reached him from working men desirous of seeing cotton mills started with 11. shares, which he supported on the ground that it would admit the poor to participation in the same advantages as capitalists. It is curious to reflect that it is the multitude of cotton mills called into existence by this measure which are at this moment denounced by the Lancashire operatives. As to the charge of abetting gambling, he retorted that to remove all temptation to gambling it would be necessary 'to burn hay-ricks, lest people should draw straws out of them.'

It was not long before Lord Palmerston's love of peace was more rudely disturbed by the Vice-President's attack on Corporation dues, which Sir Frederick Thesiger, in defending the shipping dues of Liverpool, described as 'a measure of confiscation.' The reference of its author to 'musty parchments' alarmed every landowner in the country, and his description of Corporations aroused a storm of indignation. 'They ate,' he said,' they drank, they bought, they sold, they feasted, they jobbed, until the day of reckoning was at hand.' It was a speech more serviceable to foe than friend, and when the Bill was defeated, Sir Frederick Thesiger remarked, 'Yes; Lowe

and I have thrown it out.'

It was after his exchange of the stormy atmosphere of Kidderminster for the haven of Calne that Lowe inaugurated that sanitary system to which the public health has been so deeply indebted. The touching tribute which Sir John Simon bears to his former chief is typical of the relations which he universally maintained with his subordinates. Those who knew him best liked him best. The experts and permanent officials with whom he came in contact, were so struck by the urbanity of his manner and his child-like 'docility,' that the most reserved yielded up their information freely; and so intuitive was his perception of the salient facts, and so great his power of arrangement.

ment, that the work grew rapidly under his hand. He brought an enthusiasm to his task which robbed it of half its drudgery, and the dreariest topic would be enlivened by flashes of humour and quaint illustration. If there was a spark in the flint stone, he could bring it out. When he assumed in 1859 the office of Vice-President of the Council of Education, he became ex-officio President of the Board of Health, with Sir John Simon as his specialist adviser. The net result of their labours was that what had been an unreality—the sport of such farceurs as Tom Duncombe—became a permanent Department of Public Health. The systematic inquiry into the distribution and prevention of disease was set on foot; and the 'political fad' of former ministries was dignified by the legend Sanitas sanitatum omnia sanitas. When Chancellor of the Exchequer, Lowe did not forget his former friends, and obtained an annual grant of

2000l, for the purpose of 'scientific investigation,'

The educational policy carried out by Mr. Lowe during his tenure of office from 1859 to 1864 involved him, as usual, in embittered controversy and culminated in a vote of censure. The Revised Code, which encountered such determined opposition, substituted examination for inspection; and his anxiety that the public should receive an equivalent for their expenditure led to the system of 'payment by results,' round which the battle raged so long. The position, as it appeared to him, was this: (1) A system of education must be found which would form the mind and inculcate exactitude; and (2) To justify the grant there must be an easily ascertained standard of efficiency. As a fulfilment of these requirements, he hit upon the three R's-not necessarily because it was the best, but because he could see no alternative. Those who consider the system too simple may recall Curran's eulogy on even a more modest curriculum: 'In Scotland, what a work have the four-andtwenty letters to show for themselves !- the natural enemies of vice and folly and slavery; the great sowers, but the still greater weeders of the human soul.

It is our habit to let a thing slumber and then wake up and overdo it. Having had too little education, we are trying to have too much. Robert Lowe laid out his plans for primary education; we are attempting to graft on it secondary. His scheme deserved all the epithets of 'hard,' 'inelastic,' 'mechanical,' and many others which its author accepted as logical. It had in it the seed which has borne such ill weeds that they have had to be retrenched. Its author's excuse was that he could see no escape; and among the multitude of advisers none

so far has propounded an alternative.

The following retrospect of his work puts the matter in as few words as are possible:—

'March 17, 1882.

'MY DEAR LINGEN,—Many thanks for your letter, in order to understand which I have read a speech of ninety pages which I made, and which was enough to swamp any question from its mere length.

As I understand the case, you and I viewed the three R's not only or primarily as the exact amount of instruction which ought to be given, but as an amount of knowledge which could be ascertained thoroughly by examination, and upon which we could safely base the parliamentary grant. It was more a financial than a literary preference. Had there been any other branch of useful knowledge, the possession of which could have been ascertained with equal precision, there was nothing to prevent its admission. But there was not. The mistake was, I think, that these people content themselves with saying that other knowledge is useful, without adverting to the fact that it is not so useful, and does not admit, like the three R's, of precise and accurate ascertainment.

One great merit of the plan, as it seems to me, was that it fixed a clear and definite limit; the mischief is that that limit is transgressed,

and no other can supply its place.

r

f

0

8

n

١.

f

r

a

t

f

-

t

e

e

d

e

e

0

t

-

f

11

d

y

1.

y

e

e

e

'In one sense the three R's stand alone as something which can be tested as foundation for a grant. Leave out that quality, and they are undistinguishable from any other branch of useful or elegant knowledge.

'I shall have to write or speak to Lord Spencer about the matter. . . . It seems to me to be the fallacy de dicto secundum quid ad dictum simpliciter.

'Very truly yours,

'SHERBROOKE,'

The tragical end of Robert Lowe's educational labours is typical of the fate of many another reformer. The charge of garbling and mutilation of the School Inspectors' Reports, for partisan purposes, the vote of censure, the resignation of the Minister and his demand for a Committee, with his vindication and the reversal of the vote, are matters of history. He extracted some amusement from the matter, as appears from a letter to his brother. Referring to one of the Inspectors, he writes: 'It must be excruciating torture to a man of his conceit to be made to act the censor on his own productions, under the pain of having them suppressed altogether.' His intimate friends, however, were aware how deeply it had pained him. When it was all over, he writes to his brother:—

⁴34, Lowndes Square, April 20, 1864.

^{&#}x27;They have run into me at last, but upon the whole I have no great reason to be unhappy. Relictis impedimentis salvo honore is my present motto.

'I made a success with my explanation in the House and melted the hearts even of the Tories. It was an ugly business though, and one which rarely happens. A man seldom gets into a scrape without having done what he is charged with or something else very like it. But in this case, after the most careful review of my conduct, I seem to have been absolutely blameless. I have not had too much support from the Government, but part on perfectly good terms with them. When the thing first came upon me, I said, "Out of this nettle danger we pluck the flower safety"—and so, I hope, it has proved.'

The resignation of Robert Lowe called forth a striking tribute of regard from his friends and colleagues. Great was the excitement in the fashionable and political coteries; and Lord Palmerston, Lord Granville, Sir Charles Wood, Lord Westbury, Mr. Delane, and many others, importuned him to reconsider his decision. But he adhered to his resolve, in which he had the approval of his friend Lord Lansdowne, who wrote, saying:—

'No one who knows you would think that you would cling to office; but there are many who do not (in the sense in which I use the word), and I look upon it as an advantage to a public man to have the fact made patent.'

Lowe remained out of office during the remainder of Lord Palmerston's administration, but it was upon the death of the veteran statesman in 1865 and the formation of the Russell-Gladstone government that he rose to the zenith of his fame. He took the leading part in the House of Commons in opposing their Reform Bill. It was one of the decisive battles which have left their mark upon our Island story. It was the last struggle of the old Constitution and the new Democracy. It was won—then lost by the treachery of the Great Surrender—'that dishonest victory, fatal to liberty.' The din of that eventful fight will never cease to echo in the ears of those that heard it, and those who come after us will look back to it, as a new starting point, for weal or woe, in our national life.

It was a crisis which called into play every faculty of head and heart, and it needed no common courage to step into the breach. As far as self-interest was concerned, Robert Lowe had everything to lose. He had toiled painfully up the steep ascent to power, and, now that it was in his grasp, he had to cast everything into the crucible. He had to break the ties of party and lead his enemies to the destruction of his quondam friends. The tumultuous shouts which hailed his impassioned words re-echoed through the land. He reached his zenith, and stood out for a while the most marked man in the country,

assailed

assailed with a malignity that baffles description, but sustained by the consciousness of duty done. His speeches admit of no paraphrase, and one sentence only can we select because it fitly describes the race whose birth he foresaw. Like the dragon's teeth scattered over our unhappy soil, they have increased a thousandfold since he spoke—the self-constituted tyrants of the poor, who now darken the counsel of the distracted multitude:—

ıt

t.

m

rt

a.

ıs

d

d

n

9;

10

76

d

ie

]-

e.

g

h

st

It

at

at

a

d

ie

re

P

to

of

m

d

ıd

er .

'Demagogues are the commonplace of history. They are to be found wherever popular commotion has prevailed, and they all bear to one another a strong family likeness. Their names float lightly on the stream of time; they are in some way handed down to us, but then they are as little regarded as the foam which rides on the crest of the stormy wave and bespatters the rock, which it cannot shake.'

The message of Robert Lowe was to the nation and not to one fraction of it. He warned the governing classes not to legislate in panic, nor yield to specious fallacies decked out in the garb of 'abstract justice.' His message to the unenfranchised was-the franchise is not a right but a privilege, and is not to be degraded by being thrust into the hands of the lowest, but reserved as the reward of thrift, temperance, and industry. His life had been spent in toil, he honoured labour, and he strove to create a poor man's aristocracy which should prove a perpetual incentive to their fellows to raise themselves. But the path of self-denial had little charm for those to whom the demagogues pointed out the royal road to wealth and power; and his voice was drowned in a roar of obloquy. Yet his arguments were identical with those which Lord Shaftesbury employed, and the letters which passed between them testified to the warmest sympathy. It cannot be that the man who wore out his saintly life in ministering to the poor, could have leagued himself with their enemy.

It was at this period that Robert Lowe became a welcome contributor to the pages of this Review. It is related in the 'Life' that, when Mr. Murray offered the present Editor the conduct of the Review, he took the advice of his old friend Mr. Lowe, who recommended him to accept the offer, and promised his active co-operation and assistance. The three articles which he wrote for the Review are all characteristic. In his first, which appeared in July 1867, he undertook the congenial task of 'skinning that 'ere coon,' i.e. tearing to pieces the sophistries of a number of Essayists on Reform. After an apology which seems scarcely called for to his readers, for

Vol. 177.—No. 353.

the tenderness with which he has dealt with his opponents, he concludes:—

'It is, indeed, a melancholy spectacle to see that the best education the country has to give, the society and association of our places of learning, lead to no higher and better a result than a species of Philistinism, a systematic depreciation of culture and its effects, a marked preference for what is mean and vulgar, and, we are sorry to say, a scarcely disguised hostility to our institutions. The object in most of these Essays is rather the destruction than the amelioration of the Constitution.'

This was followed in October in the same year by an article on 'Trades' Unions.' The hideous tale of outrage and intimidation which the Sheffield inquiry brought to light called forth his scathing denunciation. Selecting it as a typical case, he commented with some severity on the practice of mixing needles in the clay which was to be made into bricks by non-Unionist workmen-damaged needles being bought, on account of their cheapness, the defective eye being immaterial provided the point was good. This article so clearly lays down the evolution of Trades Unionism that it might serve as a text-book at the present day for the leaders of Neo-Unionism. To his mind, imbued with the Political Economy which has been declared of late to be 'a base lie,' the very phrases of the present day were unintelligible. What is the meaning of 'fair price,' 'fair rent,' 'fair wage,' the 'abolition of cut-throat competition,' and the compulsory idleness which the inalienable right not to work more than eight hours a day connotes? It was not to the employers but to the working class that he addressed his appeal-imploring them to have mercy on themselves. Roebuck, and Shaftesbury, and Robert Lowe are gone. Has the prophet's mantle gone with them? Is the poor man's vote of more value than his well-being? Is there no one who dares to tell the working classes the truth and raise the sacred banner of Liberty, to which thousands, whose only plea is permission to work, would rally, before they are captured by the pickets of a small but truculent minority? It is not in Ireland alone that the 'village tyrant' rules. We disguise his methods under the delicate phrase of 'moral suasion,' but we know that his 'moral suasion' is effective only because it is backed by the horrid engines of the Inquisition. The poor man suffers at his brother's hand a tyranny at which every feeling heart grows sick.

Lowe's third and last article, published in January of the following year, was entitled 'What shall we do for Ireland?' in which he insisted that State Endowment of the Roman Catholic

Church was the only efficient method of dealing with the religious difficulty in Ireland. The following passage gives eloquent expression to the views which this Review had consistently advocated for half a century previously. After considering whether the clergy would now accept the offer, and admitting that the question had become more difficult of solution since the golden opportunity which Pitt foresaw had been allowed to slip, he says:—

'The clergy would hardly be willing to take a subsistence from the extreme need and poverty of their flocks, which they could obtain from the overflowing coffers of a wealthy State. And even if they were willing, it is scarcely likely that they would be able. . . . Care must be taken to make known to the peasantry of Ireland that the State has taken upon itself to provide for the maintenance of the Roman Catholic clergy, both that the people may see that an act of tardy justice has been at last done, and that, knowing the priest to be otherwise provided for, they may be relieved from the impost which they now bear. We think that a priest questing for his support would meet with little success, when his parishioners were once aware that he had the sufficient means at his disposal, and that he preferred begging from the poor to receiving what was honestly his own. They would have little sympathy with a point of honour, the burden of which was all on them, and the honour all on him.'

h

1-

n

st

ir

ie

a-

sk

is

en

he

at

ole

It

he

m-

ne.

n's

ho

red

is

the

and

ods

hat

the

at

OW8

the

'in

olic

arch

He indignantly denounces Mr. Gladstone's 'passion for self-humiliation,' which led him to regard the outrages of Fenians as a just punishment for England's wickedness, and Mr. Bright's assertion that we had never done anything for Ireland except under pressure, and he avers on the contrary that 'England is the Cinderella who does all the work of the Imperial household.' We cannot too deeply regret that this equitable and statesmanlike course should have been abandoned for the rash legislation of Mr. Gladstone. Twenty years of turbulent discontent is the answer to those who spoke glibly of finality. But 'finality,' as we learn somewhat late in the day, 'is now a discredited word.'

He wrote a fourth article on Endowed Schools, which was subsequently issued as a pamphlet, but it proved so little acceptable, that the present Editor found it necessary to exercise his right of rejection; and we are told that, 'instead of complaining, as men of less ability have frequently done, Mr. Lowe at once acquiesced in the decision, saying, "The Editor is the best judge of what is suitable for the Review," without producing any breach in their friendship.'

With knowledge so copious and a style so admirable, it is matter of regret that Robert Lowe should not have left a more permanent contribution to literature. An invitation from the Times to join their staff followed him to Australia, and was renewed on his return; and for many years he was one of that brilliant galaxy, which helped to create the continental impression that the Times was part of the Government of England. But if those who are engaged in writing 'the world's history for a day' should feel that their work is ephemeral, they may console themselves by the reflection that their audience is enormous.

On the rejection of the Reform Bill and the accession of Lord Derby to power, a place in the Cabinet was offered to Robert Lowe, which he declined. It was surmised at the time that the decision might have been different had room been found, in addition, for a few of the prominent Adullamites. A letter of Lord Ellenborough gives expression to what was present to many minds:—

'I cannot say how sorry I am not to see your name amongst the members of the new Government, which mainly owes its existence to you. I can understand that you could not take office alone; but I had hoped that many of the Whigs would have taken this opportunity of relieving themselves from the disparaging fashion in which

they have for some time stood in subordinate co-operation with

The student of political history may well regret the tardy ripening of Mr. Gladstone's Home Rule convictions. Had his party been able to forecast his erratic policy, the schism which led to the formation of a Constitutional party would have been anticipated by nearly twenty years, and our downward course arrested.

The subsequent political history of Robert Lowe is so well known that it may be dismissed in a few words. He entered the new Parliament in 1868 as Member for the University of London, which was his final seat in the House of Commons, and of which he used to say that it had not cost him one penny—his constituents having thoughtfully sent him a stamped envelope when writing to ask permission to nominate him. It was of this seat that Mr. Disraeli in his Newport Pagnell speech in 1874 said:—

"With characteristic magnanimity I said to myself, "Unless I give a member to the London University, Mr. Lowe cannot have a seat." It was then impossible for him, and probably still is, to show himself upon any hustings with safety to his life. I said to myself, "There is so much ability lost to England," and I pique myself always on upholding and supporting ability in every party, and wherever I meet it; and I also said to myself, "One must have an eye to the main chance. If I keep Mr. Lowe in public life—and this is his only chance—I make sure that no Cabinet, even if it be brought into power

power by an overwhelming majority, can long endure and long flourish, if he be a member of it;" and, gentlemen, I think that what took place perfectly justified my prescience.'

Robert Lowe indulged in few enmities; but his dislike for Mr. Disraeli was notorious. It was hard for him to forgive the great surrender to democracy. It was Bright's virulent abuse which had produced the unpopularity to which the above speech mockingly alludes; but on Bright he had taken his revenge. It was the Cave of Adullam which wrecked Mr. Bright's hopes of becoming the 'people's liberator,' and left him the ignoble alternative of deviling for the Tories or opposing the measure, which, while he secretly feared, he professed to regard as the birthright of the people.

Robert Lowe took an active part in the debates which led to the overthrow of Mr. Disraeli's Government and to the accession of Mr. Gladstone as Prime Minister at the close of the year 1868, who offered him the Chancellorship of the Exchequer, which he accepted. His feelings on this occasion are expressed

in the well-known lines, entitled 'Success':-

h

n

se

H

ed

of

s, ne

ed

It

ch

ve

t."

elf

on

r I

the

his

nto

Wer

'Success has come, the thing that men admire, The pomp of office, and the care of State; Ambition has nought left her to desire; Success has come, but, ah! has come too late.

'Where is the bounding pulse of other days,
That would have flashed enchantment through my frame,
The lips that would have loved to speak my praise,
The eyes that would have brightened at my name?

'O vanity of vanities! For Truth
And Time dry up the spring where joy was rife;
Teach us we are but shadows of our youth,
And mock us with the emptiness of life.'

Lowe worked hard at his new office, and seldom took part in the discussions of the House of Commons on other subjects.

'There were,' says his biographer, 'special reasons why he should thus have decided to attend rigorously to the work of his own department; the chief of which was that he had no very enthusiastic belief in the final outcome of Mr. Gladstone's Irish policy. This remark may, perhaps, need a few words of explanation. From the hour that Mr. Gladstone made him the offer of the Chancellorship of the Exchequer, the latter, recognizing that he could never regard certain public questions in the same light as his new chief, realized that by accepting the office he subjected Mr. Gladstone to unpleasant attacks from various quarters. So vigilant an opponent as Disraeli would be sure to attack the new Government at its most vulnerable point, which would be the antagonism that existed between large

bodies of the working classes and the Chancellor of the Exchequer. Viewed in this light, Lowe thought there was a certain magnanimity and high-minded friendship in Mr. Gladstone's action. It would have been contrary to his nature not fully to recognize the obligation. From this time he never permitted himself to say a harsh or unkind word of Mr. Gladstone personally, though, as plainly shown by their famous discussions on the subject of manhood suffrage in the "Fortnightly" and "Nineteenth Century" Reviews in 1877 and 1878, their political differences continued to exist, and were, indeed, from their very nature, irreconcilable.'

His career as a Finance Minister has been variously judged. There is a deep-rooted suspicion, in the business mind, of brilliant men, and it may be doubted whether the City ever felt quite at ease under the rule of the paradoxical, epigrammatic Chancellor. The public, too, fastened on the trivialities rather than on the solid achievements. There is still a hazy impression that they paid an extra quarter's income-tax; and, beyond this and 'matches,' little remains. We may, indeed, express surprise that a Cabinet of Political Economists and Free Traders should have been 'unanimous' in advocating a heavy impost on a native industry, under which it would have succumbed to foreign importations, unless these had been held in check by an import duty. The author of the ill-fated measure found some consolation under defeat in discovering how few of his friends were aware that lucellum is the diminutive of lucrum, and he was much amused with the lines written on the occasion :-

'Ex luce lucellum, we all of us know;
But if Lucy can't sell 'em, how then Mr. Lowe?'

His brief tenure of the Home Office closed his ministerial career.

A temperament so susceptible to ideas and a sensibility so keen as that possessed by Robert Lowe, might easily have drifted into sentimentality. But any such tendency was effectually held in check by a masculine mind and a strong natural preference for facts over theories. Imbued as he was with the spirit of classic literature, the cry for the emancipation of the Ionian Islands might naturally have caught his ear, but no tinge of maudlin sentiment is discoverable in the reference which he makes to the proposed surrender of our impregnable stronghold in the Adriatic, when writing to Mr. Bernal Osborne:—

'Gladstone goes to the Ionian Islands to raise them, as he says, in the social scale, his view being that they are an oppressed and injured nationality. . . . Of course he is to advise the cession of five of the islands, to our Cabinet, which seems to want as much advising as the Crown, of which it is the adviser.'

The

The same letter incidentally refers to the twenty-nine speeches made in one day by Mr. Gladstone on the Divorce Bill, which entitle him to the credit of having invented 'obstruction.'

The project for excavating Troy was another case in which the feelings of the Chancellor of the Exchequer were strongly enlisted, but he declined to relax his hold upon the public purse. He used to recall with pleasure the neatness of his reply. 'etiam periere ruinee.' But Lucan's assertion was happily disproved; and the 'Herodes Atticus' whom England could not produce, was ultimately found in Herman Schliemann. The doubts which rival archæologists raised whether his palace of Priam might not be 'the palace of Priam's pig,' are forgotten, But the unearthed treasures remain as an imperishable memento of the man whose 'imagination guided the spade' till he had pierced the secret of the hill of Hissarlik and solved the problem of ages. Robert Lowe lacked the plausibility which enables a Minister to send away a deputation empty, yet well satisfied. When looking back on these times, he says: 'I could not conciliate my victims or my antagonists, because I could not find them.' But probably the keenest eyesight would have failed to discover any sign of satisfaction on the faces of the deputation which, after a most patient hearing, he dismissed with the remark that whatever influence he possessed with the Government he would employ to defeat their scheme. A Minister in the same Cabinet was said to 'speak the truth, but not too much of it,' but Robert Lowe, like the Moor Alfaquil, preferred to liberate his mind, even though he should suffer for it.

Achilles was so little enamoured of the dreary dignity of Hades that he longed to be a day-labourer on earth, and men like Disraeli and Robert Lowe could never forget that their fame had been won as Commoners. His elevation to the peerage as Viscount Sherbrooke in 1880 was the virtual close of his career, How he regarded the change may be gathered from the terms in which he treated his honours—'vapulo (I am beaten), veneo (I am sold), exsulo (I am shelved), fio (I am done for).'

- t

n

f

e

d

re

In these days, when the public claims the right of entry into the inner chambers of life, which were once held sacred, a biographer is to be congratulated who can draw aside the curtain without reserve. The keen scent which Mr. Martin has shown for sources of information has, indeed, stood him in good stead; and the diligence with which Lord Sherbrooke's contemporaries have ransacked their memories for recollections of their lost friend, is sufficient evidence of their esteem. The respect which is due to the sterling qualities displayed by his public conduct

is softened into affection by the contemplation of his home life,

which was one of singular charm.

He was never overweighted by his learning, but his versatile humour could produce a sonnet for a lady or a fairy tale for a child. His library displayed the catholicity of his taste, and he had garnered its contents to good purpose. But the pursuit of knowledge never palled; and when the long night settled down upon him, his favourite resource was listening to reading. His frequent 'Pass on' proved how much he was able to 'take as read.' But it was significant of his natural bent that he never wearied of the rush of Homeric battle, and he would turn from many a graver topic to linger over such tales as Aristæus mourning for his bees.

But such a life conveys other lessons than those that lie upon the surface. We see him tried by adversity and prosperity, and in both preserving the even tenor of his way. In the midst of success he betrays a doubt whether the game of life is worth the candle; nor could the vexations of his lot prevail over the old-world courtesy, his patience and considerateness. By the sweetness and gaiety of his disposition he effectually disguised from those around him the hourly mortifications which blindness

imposed.

Such was the man whose portrait we have painted, as he would have wished it, in the sober tints of truth. He erred as we all have done. Yet how small do the blemishes appear

which marred a character of such nobility!

At a time of disorganization and panic, when the old guide posts are thrown down, and new and strange doctrines gain a hearing, alike from the ignorant and the timorous, it is well that there should be men who refuse to leave the dull road of experience in pursuit of every will-o'-the-wisp that dances over the morass. It is well that there should be men, heedless alike of fear and favour, who are content to follow where duty leads and entrust their memory to the justice of their countrymen.

ART. III.—Poème adressé à Adèle, fille de Guillaume le Conquérant, par Baudri, Abbé de Bourgeuil. Edited by L. Delisle ('Mémoires de la Société des Antiquaires de Normandie,' vol. xxviii.). Paris, 1870.

e

of n

is

15

T

m

LS

n

d

h

is

ed

55

ne

as ar

de

a

ell

of

er ke

ds

RT.

·1710107

In an article on the late Professor Freeman that appeared in this Review just a year ago, we had occasion to criticize, among other matters, his treatment of the Battle of Hastings, and to show that on this subject, where he was admittedly at his strongest, he had most seriously erred. Since the publication of this article, the attention of English scholars has been drawn to a new source of information on the battle, an authority which was clearly unknown to Mr. Freeman, although in print some five years before the publication of his final edition. To Mr. Blackburne Daniell belongs the credit of calling the attention of scholars to this poem in the pages of that excellent periodical 'The English Historical Review.' We propose here to examine critically its bearing on the great battle, and incidentally to illustrate the importance of its discovery.

M. Delisle, the editor of the poem, has briefly but sufficiently described its origin. It was written by Baudri, Abbot of Bourgeuil, who was raised in 1107 to the See of Dol, and was dedicated by him to the Countess Adela, daughter of the Conqueror, wife of Stephen, Count of Blois, and mother of our own King Stephen. Extending to 1368 lines, it takes for its subject the chamber of Adela, resplendent with embroidered hangings, among which, most glorious in her eyes, and most precious in our own, a velum, on which was depicted the story of her father's conquest, adorned the walls of the recess surrounding her sculptured bed. To this velum, wrought in silk, and blazing with gold and silver, if not with pearls and gems, the ecstatic author devotes 360 lines. But although the figures were so faithful to life, although—precisely as in the Bayeux Tapestry, and even in greater detail—the scenes had written titles, the worthy abbot must have claimed the license, so dear to the heart of medieval chroniclers, of interpolating the usual appropriate speeches, though not wholly from his own imagination. He was living, we must remember, at the time of the Conquest, for not only was he Abbot of Bourgeuil within thirteen years of that event, but he had himself seen, he tells us, the famous comet that, men deemed, foretold the invasion of England. He was, therefore, himself familiar with the whole story of the Conquest, while professing to describe its scenes from the 'veil' alone. On the literary merit of his

tale

tale we cannot here dwell, although his spirited sketch of the departure of the Norman fleet betrays his practised hand:

'A domina pupi clamatur: "Solvite funes"
Funes solvuntur; navita quisque ruit.
Nauticus exoritur clamor mixtusque tumultus;
Uxores, matres, turbaque plorat iners;
Ista virum votis, hæc virgo salutat amicum,
Insequiturque oculis quæque puella suum;
Ista serenatos reditus celeresque precatur,
Nec vir nec mulier abstinet a lacrimis.'

We must fix our attention on his narrative of the battle, and see what we can learn from this fresh authority, recovered for us by French scholars from that storehouse of the nations, the Vatican.

We would not be understood as in any way blaming the late Mr. Freeman for not having made use of this interesting poem. No one would have welcomed it more eagerly had he known it was in print, and the difficulty in these days of making oneself acquainted with all that has been published on a given subject can only be realized by those who have essayed the task. As we have differed from Mr. Freeman in his view of the battle, and may have to carry our difference further still, it is pleasant to dwell at the outset on the striking confirmation that this poem affords of the high and indeed paramount importance he attached to the Bayeux Tapestry:—

'It will be seen that, throughout this volume, I accept the witness of the Bayeux Tapestry as one of my highest authorities. I do not hesitate to say that I look on it as holding the first place among the authorities on the Norman side, . . . as a primary authority for the subject of the present volume, as in fact the highest authority for the Norman side. . . . It will be easily seen that my narrative [of the battle] is mainly drawn from the Tapestry, William of Poitiers, and Guy. . . . On the whole, I look on the Tapestry as the highest authority of the three.' ('Norm. Conq.' iii. 563, 572, 757, 768 [2nd Ed.].)

In this high estimate we expressed our entire concurrence.* It is now confirmed, not merely by the similar character of the work that Baudri independently describes, but by the fact that the latter's poem must have been written, at latest, within forty years of the Conquest, thus supporting, for such embroidery, that virtually contemporary date on which Mr. Freeman, in his able essay, so strenuously insists. But, apart from its bearing on this question, we may claim for the

^{*} Quarterly Review,' July 1892, p. 15.

poem, from its early date, the same status as for the three authorities that Mr. Freeman mentions; we may place it, with them, in the foremost rank among our authorities for the battle. And, this being so, we may state at once that, like its fellows, it supports our own contention; it wholly ignores throughout the existence of a 'palisade.'

ne

d

or

1e

te

n.

it

elf

ct

ls

e,

nt

is

he

88

ot

he

he

on

he

nd

est 68

..

er

by

at

or

ch

ut,

he

-

m,

On examining in detail Baudri's poem, we find that the portion of the battle on which it throws perhaps the most light is its opening phase. There is no question that the fight began with an advance of the Norman infantry: William of Poitiers and Bishop Guy are in complete accordance on the fact. But what was the intention of that advance? Mr. Freeman assumed, without hesitation, that 'they were to strive to break down the palisades . . . and so to make ready the way for the charge of the horse' (p. 467); 'that the French infantry had to toil up the hill, and to break down the palisade' (p. 477). But we find, on reference, that the above writers say nothing of any such intention, and do not even mention the existence of a palisade. Moreover, the only weapons they speak of are slings and bows and arrows, which are scarcely the tools for pioneers. But William of Poitiers puts us on the track of a very different explanation: 'Pedites itaque Normanni propius accedentes provocant Anglos, missilibus in eos vulnera dirigunt atque necem.' Here Baudri comes to our aid :-

'Nam neque Normannus consertos audet adire Nec valet a cuneo quemlibet excipere. Arcubus utantur dux imperat atque balistis; Nam prius has mortes Anglia tune didicit. Tunc didicere mori quam non novere sagitta Creditur a cælo mors super ingruere Hos velut a longe comitatur militis agmen, Palantes post se miles ut excipiat.'

The Normans dared not face the serried ranks of the English: the maxim that cavalry should not charge unbroken infantry was asserting itself already. But the only means of breaking those ranks, of throwing the English into confusion, was to gall them by archers and slingers till some of them should sally forth, when their assailants would turn tail and leave them to be caught in the open and ridden down. As Bishop Guy expresses it :-

> 'Præmisit pedites committere bella sagittis, Et balistantes inscrit in medio, Quatinus infigant volitantia vultibus arma, Vulneribusque datis ora retro faciant, Ordine post pedites sperat stabilire Quirites.

These tactics, says Baudri, were crowned with success; the maddened English, as they dashed forth to strike their tormentors to the ground, were cut off in every direction by the horsemen waiting their chance :-

> 'Tunc præ tristitia gens effera præque pudore Egreditur palans, insequiturque vagos. Normanni simulantque fugam fugiuntque fugantes, Intercepit eos undique præpes equus. Ilico cæduntur; sic paulatim minuuntur, Nec minuebatur callidus ordo ducis.'

This account is both intelligible and consistent, but differs wholly from that of Mr. Freeman. It had, however, been virtually anticipated by Mr. Oman, who, in his 'Art of War in the Middle Ages' (p. 25), points out, with much felicity, that

'the archers, if unsupported by the knights, could easily have been driven off the field by a general charge. United, however, by the skilful tactics of William, the two divisions of the invading army won the day. The Saxon mass was subjected to exactly the same trial which befell the British squares in the Battle of Waterloo: incessant charges by a gallant cavalry were alternated with a destructive fire of missiles. Nothing can be more maddening than such an ordeal to the infantry soldier, rooted to the spot by the necessities of his formation.'

Let us compare the two theories. Mr. Freeman's is not even consistent. He first tells us that for the knights to charge, with 'the triple palisade still unbroken, would have been sheer madness'; in fact it was 'altogether useless' for them to advance until the infantry had broken down the palisade. But this the infantry failed to do, whereupon-the cavalry charged 'the impenetrable fortress of timber '(p. 479)! One is surely reminded of the immortal Don, when, 'á todo el galope de Rocinante,' he charged the windmill. Our own theory involves no such inconsistencies. We hold-not as a conjecture based on a hypothetical palisade, but on the excellent authority of Baudri and William of Poitiers, that the infantry were used for the definite purpose of galling the English by their missiles, and so enticing them to leave their ranks and become a prey to the horse. As soon as their line had thus been broken, the cavalry were to charge.

Up to this point, the English army, as a whole, had kept its formation; but now the strain on its patience had become too great to be borne. Breaking its ranks, with one accord, the whole host rushed upon its foes, and drove them before it in

confusion right up to the Duke's post :-

'Tandem

'Tandem jactura gens irritata frequenti,
Ordinibus spretis irruit unanimis.
Tunc quoque plus solito fugientum terga cecidit,
Et miles vultum fugit ad usque ducis.'

This explains what had always been to us a difficulty, namely the panic-stricken flight of the Normans at this stage of the battle. That they should have 'lost heart' (p. 480) at the firmness of the English is natural enough; but that they should have 'turned and fled' (ib.) from a force which did not pursue them seemed improbable. The difficulty is solved by Baudri's

mention of the wild onslaught by the English.

eir

by

ers

en

in

een

the

my

me

00:

de-

uch ties

ven

ge,

eer

nce

the

im-

ded

te,

uch

n a

dri

the

and

to

the

its

too

the

in

dem

Again, Baudri's poem suggests a novel view by its definite statement that the Normans in their flight reached the Duke's post. Mr. Freeman imagined that the Duke himself had been fighting in the front line (pp. 479, 480), but a careful comparison of his two authorities, William of Poitiers and Bishop Guy (p. 482), will show that, on the contrary, they support Baudri's statement. Each speaks of the Duke as 'meeting' (occurrens-occurrit) the fugitives, a difficulty which Mr. Freeman evaded by writing that 'he met or pursued the fugitives.' From this flight the Normans were rallied by the desperate efforts of the Duke himself, who, as is usual at such moments, was believed to have fallen. We deem this episode a fixed point, and it conveniently divides the battle. All our four leading authorities—the Tapestry, William of Poitiers, Bishop Guy, and Baudri-are here in complete agreement. William describes the Duke as 'nudato insuper capite'; Guy tells us that 'iratus galea nudat et ipse caput'; Baudri writes, 'subito galeam submovet a capite'; in the Tapestry, 'William (writes Dr. Bruce), when he wishes to show himself in order to contradict the rumour that he has been killed, is obliged to lift his helmet almost off his head' (p. 98). It is singular that so striking and well-established an episode is wholly ignored by Wace.

We may here conveniently break our narrative to glance at an attempted vindication of Mr. Freeman's 'conception of the battle,' contributed to the 'Contemporary Review' for March, by Mr. T. A. Archer. Although we impugned the accuracy of 'The Norman Conquest' passim, Mr. Archer confined his rejoinder to one point alone, the Battle of Hastings. And though, even in the brief space we could then allot to that subject, we enumerated several matters on which we differed from Mr. Freeman, Mr. Archer does not attempt to reply to us on more than one of these matters, the existence of a 'palisade.' We shall now not merely re-affirm our position in this matter—

which

which Mr. Archer, we shall show, has utterly failed to shake but shall carry our criticism further still, as the best reply to

his efforts.

Let us then glance at the episode described by Mr. Freeman as the 'great slaughter of the French in the western ravine' (p. 489). We select this as having been invented by Mr. Freeman alone, and as illustrating the peculiar use he made, at times, of his authorities. Now there is no question that the Norman knights suffered, in the course of the day, at least one such disaster as the nobles of France at Courtrai (1302) or her cuirassiers at Gravelotte. But five authorities, as far as we can see, place the incident in the thick of the battle, while three others assign it to the pursuit of the defeated English. It is not strange, therefore, that some writers should have held that there was but one such incident: Mr. Freeman, however, holds that there were two; and we expressly disclaim questioning his view, the matter being one of opinion. Assuming then, as he does, that the episode occurred in the course of the battle, we turn to the spirited version of Wace, as Mr. Archer defies us to 'impeach Wace's authority' (C. R., p. 346). The 'old Norman poet' is here very precise. He first tells us (Il. 7,869-70, 8,103-6) that the English had made a 'fosse,' which the Normans had passed unnoticed in their advance. These passages Mr. Freeman accepts without question (p. 476). But then Wace proceeds to state (ll. 8,107-20) that the Normans driven back, as we have seen, by the English, tumbled, men and horses, into this treacherous 'fosse,' and perished in great numbers. Now Wace, far from standing alone, is here in curiously close agreement with the Tapestry of Bayeux. Two successive scenes in that 'most authentic record' are styled 'Hic ceciderunt simul Angli et Franci in prœlio; hic Odo episcopus baculum tenens confortat pueros.' Wace describes these scenes in thirtysix lines (ll. 8,103-8,138), devoting eighteen lines to the first and the same number to the second. Actual comparison alone can show how close the agreement is. Henry of Huntingdon, we may add, independently confirms the statement that English as well as French perished in the fatal fosse.

Now all this is quite opposed to Mr. Freeman's 'conception of the battle.' He had, therefore, to adapt, with no gentle hands, his authorities to his requirements. Cinderella's stepmother, in the Danish version, when her daughter's foot could not be forced into the golden shoe, armed herself, we read, with axe and scissors, and trimmed it to the requisite shape. With no less decision the late Professor set about his own task. Wace's evidence he simply suppressed; Henry of Huntingdon's he ignored;

to

an

ie'

Ar.

at

the

ne

or

we

ile

It

eld

er,

on-

en,

tle,

fies

old

70,

ans

Mr.

ace

ck, nto

ow

ose

nes

unt

um

rty-

irst

one

on,

lish

ion

ntle

tep-

not

axe less

evi-

red; but but that of the Bayeux Tapestry could not be so easily disposed of. We invite particular attention to his treatment of this, his highest authority.' Retaining in its natural place (pp. 481-2) the second of the two scenes we have described, he threw forward the one preceding it to a later stage of the battle (p. 490). Nor did his vigorous adaptation stop even here. The scene thus wrenched from its place depicts a single incident: mounted Normans are tumbling headlong into a ditch at the foot of a mound, on which 'light-armed' English stand assailing them with their weapons. The fight is hand to hand; the bodies touch. And yet the Professor treats this scene as a description of two quite separate events happening at a distance from each other. These he terms (p. 489) the stand of the English at the detached hill'; and the 'great slaughter of the French in the western ravine.' But on referring to his own ground-plan, we find that this 'ravine' and the 'detached hill' were a quarter of a mile apart, with the slopes of the main hill between them.

Our criticism here is twofold. In the first place, Mr. Freeman endeavoured to conceal the liberties he had taken with his leading authority. No one would gather from his narrative of the battle that any such violence had been used; nor would anyone who read of the 'hill' episode that 'the scene is vividly shown in the Tapestry' (p. 489), and, subsequently, of the 'ravine' disaster, that 'this scene is most vividly shown in the Tapestry' (p. 490), imagine that 'the incidents of the ravine and the little hill' (p. 768) are in the Tapestry one and the In the second place, the large part which the writer's own imagination plays in his narrative of the fight is here clearly seen. There is nothing, for instance, in any authority to connect 'the western ravine' with 'the great slaughter of the French.' It is placed by those who mention it in a 'fosse,' 'fossatum,' or 'fovea.' 'If Wace is any authority,' to quote Mr. Archer's words (p. 348), 'the question is settled once and for all': the slaughter took place not in the 'ravine,' but in a ditch which, according to him, the English had dug to the south of the hill, and which, according to Henry of Huntingdon, they had cunningly concealed. Mr. Freeman produces no authority in support of his own fancy: his only argument is that the slaughter was an allege of a

'must have happened somewhere to the south or south-west of the hill. The small ravine to the south-west seems exactly what is wanted.' (P. 771.)

The 'western ravine,' however, does not fulfil these requirements (see ground-plan); while Wace's 'fosse,' which—though

here ignoring it—he had already accepted, lay, as required, to the south of the hill. Wace mentions another instance (ll. 1737— 50) in which this stratagem was adopted; but whether our ditch was dug, as he states, expressly or not, the fact of its

existence does not depend on his evidence alone.

Having now dealt, for the first time, with two of the leading episodes of the battle,—the opening attack and the 'fosse' disaster,—and shown that Mr. Freeman, in each instance, relied on imagination instead of authorities, we proceed to re-affirm our denial of that 'palisade' which forms, as it were, the linchpin of Mr. Freeman's narrative. We shall first briefly recapitulate the arguments on which we relied; we shall then examine those that Mr. Archer has adduced in support of Mr. Freeman; and lastly we shall show that our case is unshaken, and that Mr. Archer has failed to vindicate the late Professor's view. For let it be remembered that he undertook to 'show Mr. Freeman to have been entirely right in the view he took of the whole question' (p. 344). It is no view of Mr. Archer with which we have to deal; it is, as before, that of the Professor, which is merely upheld by his champion.

But before we approach the arguments and proofs, we must glance at Mr. Archer's method. We need no better witness to the hopeless nature of his task than the fact that Mr. Freeman's

vindication has been left to such hands as his.

'Non tali auxilio nec defensoribus istis Tempus eget.'

'It seems,' he reluctantly admits, 'to be the general opinioneven among historical scholars'—that we have proved Mr. Freeman 'to have erred in more than one important matter which concerns the very essence of his work' (p. 337). And it is, we presume, because this is so that no scholar of repute has come forward to impugn our case. Indeed, Mr. Archer himself betrays the weakness of his cause by the tactics to which he has recourse, and to which we must briefly advert. He first endeavours to damage our criticism by asserting that our arguments 'abound in errors of a similar kind' to Mr. Freeman's; indeed in 'errors far more serious than most' of his. He also rashly assumes that the criticisms to which we were limited by space were the only ones we could offer. He next endeavours to eke out his case by misrepresenting or suppressing what Mr. Freeman says; and then, coolly claiming that our 'attack must be held to have failed' (p. 353), he takes upon himself to lecture us, in a style that Mr. Chadband might have envied, on the need for greater humility and the difficulty of attaining truth.

Now

Now if our would-be critic had been honest or straightforward in his tactics, and if he had not had the effrontery to lament 'errors' and 'blunders' of his own invention, we should have dealt gently with him. As it is, he must take the consequences

of the line he has chosen to adopt.

to

7-

ur

its

ng

e

ed

m

h-

u-

ne

n;

at

W.

ee-

he

ith

or,

ust

to

n's

ee-

ich is,

has

elf

has

en-

nts

eed

hly

ace

eke

nan

l to

, in

for

Vow

Even if Mr. Archer had convicted us-which he has not-of errors, 'capital' or other, he would still be no nearer to proving the existence of a palisade. But with one solitary exception, the errors he so rashly parades have no existence in fact. In a purely rhetorical passage we spoke of the 'long slow agony of that September day' (p. 20), where we ought to have written 'that October day.' As we never questioned, or dreamed of disputing, the date of the battle, it is obvious that this 'little slip,' this 'trivial error'-as even Mr. Archer terms it-in no way affected our arguments and was wholly irrelevant to the issue. Even Mr. Freeman's friend and follower, the Rev. W. Hunt, writing of the Battle of Tinchebrai, fought '2 Sept.' [sic], tells us that the Battle of Hastings was 'fought almost on the same day forty years before' ('Dict. Nat. Biog.' xxv. 443). But only Mr. Archer would seize on so obvious a 'slip,' or accuse the writer of deliberately assigning a new date to the battle. A precisely similar slip occurs in Mr. Freeman's narrative (p. 472), where he speaks of 'left' instead of 'right.' But so obvious a 'slip' we scorned to notice. Mr. Archer, on the contrary, finds himself reduced to making the most of ours. For it is all he has to show for our loudly proclaimed 'errors': the parturient mountain has produced its mouse. As to the rest, is it not Mr. Lang who has said that 'it is not hard to confute an opponent, if it may be done by attributing to him a theory which he does not hold, and disproving that? This, as might be expected, is Mr. Archer's device. We could disprove his charges in detail, but is it really worth while repudiating as a grave, a 'capital error,' our alleged 'opinion that Mr. Freeman invented the palisade theory' (p. 343)? The real point, of course, is whether Mr. Freeman was right or wrong about the palisade; not whether he was the first to suggest it. Yet we in nowise shirk the issue. So far were we from holding the opinion' Mr. Archer assigns to us that in the first draft of our article (which we hold) we had discussed the influence, in this matter, on Mr. Freeman of Taylor's Wace, which he is known to have used. The reason of our striking out the passage was that we deemed it unjust to Mr. Freeman to suggest that he was merely misled by others, instead of going to the original sources and forming his own opinion. Nor does Mr. Archer honour his memory in insisting on the former alternative (p. 340). Vol. 177.—No. 353.

But though we never imagined Mr. Freeman to have first 'invented' the palisade, we may point out that he not only developed it, but did invent, in support of it, two original misrenderings on which we duly insisted, and shall insist again. Another of our alleged 'errors'-one of which our critic seems to be particularly proud - is that the hill of battle, being 'an open down,' could not supply the timber for the alleged palisade. Does Mr. Archer attempt to disprove this statement of fact? Of course not. Indeed, Mr. Freeman himself had spoken of 'the solitude which once reigned around the hoar apple-tree.' Carefully refraining from quoting our words-(pp. 341, 343), which were specially limited to the hill itself, Mr. Archer informs us that there were woods near—which we well knew and never denied-and claims thus to produce another 'error.' So, too, with the 'blunder' on p. 342, which he subdivides into three grave errors. Does he attempt to disprove our statements that 'paliz' is used for palisade (for which it is the only distinctive term), or 'mairrien' for timber, in Wace, or our assertion that 'neither of these terms is found in his account of the battle '? No, our critic addresses himself, as usual, to what our argument 'seems to imply,' or 'seems to assume,' in his own opinion. And in proceeding to impugn that, he promptly falls himself into the double 'error' of stating that Wace only uses the word 'paliz' twice, and that he only uses 'mairrien' for the special timber 'which Duke William had prepared in Normandy' for his 'chastel' on the English coast (p. 343). Both these statements, on which Mr. Archer founds, are directly contrary to fact. It is thus that our 'errors' have been manufactured; blown, as a boy blows bubbles, they melt, like bubbles, in the air.

And now let us recapitulate our arguments in the matter of the 'palisade.' We first showed that Mr. Freeman admitted it to be an entirely novel device introduced, on this occasion, by Harold (p. 11). We next pointed out that its 'wooden walls' would render superfluous a 'shield-wall,' as admitted, behind it; and we further insisted that, as 'the battle followed almost immediately on the arrival of Harold,' and as there was no timber available on the hill itself, its construction would be primâ facie unlikely (p. 13). Having thus demonstrated that the onus probandi rested on Mr. Freeman, we enquired what his proof was; and we found it to consist of three passages, one in Henry of Huntingdon, which he had misapprehended (p. 13), and two in Wace's poem, of which we wrote:—

'In one, "the triple gate of entrance" is based on a passage in the 'Roman de Rou,' referring, not to a palisade crowning the summit of the hill, but to a ditch ("boen fossé") which Mr. Freeman places at its foot; in the other, the description of the palisade... is taken from a passage in the same poem referring not to a palisade, but to the "shield-wall." (P. 14.)

These statements are unassailable; we can prove them up to the hilt. Here are the only allusions that Mr. Freeman makes to 'the' fosse: they show that he placed it, not on the summit, but 'to the south' of 'the foot of the hill.' It could have, therefore, nothing to do with the alleged 'palisade.'

P. 447.

st

1

n. ic

e,

ıe

e-

ıd

ar

ds.

ve

er

he

ve

is

e, is

as

to

gn

ng

aly

am

ish

her

rs'

ley

of

lit

by

lls'

it:

ost

no

be

hat

his

one

ded

e in

um-

mit

P. 476.

'He [Harold] occupied the hill; he surrounded it on all its accessible sides by a palisade, with a triple gate of entrance, and defended it to the south by an artificial ditch.' (Wace, 11. 12,106-9.)

The Normans had crossed the [sic] English fosse, and were now at the foot of the hill with the palisades and the axes right before them. (Wace, Il. 13,215-8.)

Our second statement rests, as we explained (p. 14), on the definite assertion, by Mr. Freeman himself (p. 763)—we quote, of course, throughout, his last edition—that the 'crucial passage' in Wace describes, and describes well, 'the array of the shield-wall.'

In his note on 'the details of the Battle of Senlac' (p. 756), Mr. Freeman explained that he had given the authorities on which his statements rested, adding:—

'Each reader can therefore judge for himself how far my narrative is borne out by my authorities.'

Loyally keeping to this principle, we tested his statements by the authorities he gave for them—with the above result. On Mr. Freeman's own showing, he had failed to produce any definite authority for the existence of his 'palisade.'

We then examined, independently, all the authorities for ourselves. The result of our enquiry was summed up in these words:—

'If he (Mr. Freeman) found it needful, in his story of the great battle, to mention this barricade about a score of times, it must have occupied a prominent place in every contemporary narrative. And yet we assert without fear of contradiction that (diamissing the "Roman de Rou") in no chronicle or poem, among all Mr. Freeman's authorities, could he find any ground for this singular delusion; while the Bayeux Tapestry itself, which he rightly places at their head, will be searched in vain for a palisade, or for anything faintly resembling it, from beginning to end of the battle.' (P. 15.)

G 2

On

On this passage we take our stand: it is the very essence of our case. We made our statement 'without fear of contradiction'; and it is not contradicted. Moreover, we can now further strengthen it by appealing to Baudri's poem, an authority of the first rank, in which, as in the others, there is no allusion to

the existence of any 'palisade.'

It will be observed that, in this passage, we expressly excluded Wace's poem. We did so because—although, as we have seen, Mr. Freeman failed to produce from it any proof of a palisade—we preferred to leave it an open question whether Wace did or not believe the English to have fought behind a palisade. In rebutting Mr. Freeman's evidence, that question did not arise.

There is another argument that we refrained from bringing forward because we thought it superfluous. The Normans, of course, as Mr. Freeman reminds us, magnified the odds against them: 'Nothing but the special favour of God could have given his servants a victory over their enemies, which was truly thiraculous' (p. 440). William of Poitiers, he adds (p. 479), sets forth their difficulties in detail:—

'Angli nimium adjuvantur superioris loci opportunitate, quem sine procursu tenent, et maxime conferti; atque ingenti quoque numerositate sua atque validissima corpulentia; præterea pugnæ instrumentis, quæ facile per scuta vel alia tegmina viam inveniunt.'

Now William, who was not only a contemporary writer, but, says Mr. Freeman (p. 757), 'understood' the site, had, obviously, every inducement to include, among the difficulties of the Normans, that special 'development,' which, according to Mr. Freeman (pp. 444, 468), 'the foresight of Harold' had introduced on this occasion, and which, he assures us, involved 'a frightful slaughter' of the Normans. And yet this writer is absolutely silent, both here and throughout the battle, as to the existence of a barricade of any sort or kind.

Having thus traced our own argument, as it stood, in our former article, let us now see what Mr. Archer is able to urge against it. We shall pass over none of his pleas, but shall set them forth fairly, in turn, as reference to his article will prove.

Characteristically at the very outset (p. 336) he proceeds to

garble one of our statements thus :-

'He [Mr. Freeman] obtained the sole authorities that he could adduce for its existence, in the one case by mistranslating [sic] his rench, and in the other by misconstruing his Latin.' (P. 15.)

It is the Reviewer himself who must bear the blame—such as it is—of misconstruing [sic] his French and misappreciating his evidence. (P. 336.)

Now this perversion must be deliberate, because it is absolutely essential to Mr. Archer's argument. Our charge, not of 'misconstruing,' but of 'mistranslating [sic] his French' (p. 15), was based, solely and explicitly, on Mr. Freeman rendering 'escuz' as 'barricades,' not as 'shields' (p. 15). With characteristic recklessness Mr. Archer scornfully observes:—

0

f

r

n

g

of

st

ve

ly

),

m

ue

æ

ut,

ly,

he

to

ad

ed

is

the

our

rge

set

re.

to

who

s it

his

his

low

'The literary Rhadamanthus should assess the heaviest penalty to M. Pluquet, the originator of the blunder, who, as a Frenchman, should have known better than to mistranslate his own language.' (P. 340.)

But how does M. Pluquet render 'escuz'? Why, as we learn from Mr. Archer himself (p. 339), by 'boucliers'; that is, by 'shields.' Sir Alexander Malet, he also reminds us, rendered it 'bucklers'; while Taylor, whose work Mr. Freeman used,. translated it 'shields.' It was obviously, therefore, incumbent on Mr. Archer to vindicate the rendering by 'barricades' of a term which is one of the commonest in Wace, and which, aseveryone knows, invariably means 'shield.' Yet he does not even attempt to produce a single instance in his favour, but contents himself with the ludicrous rendering 'shield-[like defence]s' (p. 348)! Even for himself, such a travesty must have proved too great, since we find him later (p. 351) rendering the word simply as 'shields.' So too with our second point, the passage in Henry of Huntingdon, to whose words Mr. Freeman appealed (pp. 444, 757) as the sole evidence for Harold's fortification of the hill. We have reason to know that our challenge of that passage as an obvious misrendering has had great weight with historical scholars. Prominently assailing this evidence, which Mr. Freeman had placed in the forefront of his narrative, we claimed that it was based only on his 'misconstruing his Latin,' and that inde referred to Harold's troops alone. Here was a charge which no one defending him could afford to overlook. And yet Mr. Archer carefully ignores it. Lacking the courage to rebut or the honesty to admit it, he transers our charge of 'misconstruing' to Wace, and, on our real charge, is absolutely, significantly silent.

The actual reply to our case, in the matter of the palisade, will be found on pp. 344-352 of Mr. Archer's article. And the four principal devices upon which it rests are these: (1) he represents us as relying specially on Wace, which is the exact converse of the truth (supra, p. 84); (2) he assigns to us an 'admission' as to the English fosse, which is exactly contrary to our statement, but on which he bases an argument; (3) he

suppresses

suppresses throughout Mr. Freeman's repeated admission of a 'shield-wall,' which would be fatal to his argument; (4) he 'mainly' relies on Wace—that is to say, he treats Wace quite apart from the other authorities, who, as we have seen, are

unanimous in ignoring the 'palisade.'

We may conveniently combine the first and fourth points, because Mr. Archer, having falsely charged us with 'mainly relying upon Wace, makes that his excuse for doing so himself. We had carefully explained (p. 14) that it was Mr. Freeman who 'specially relied' on Wace, while we ourselves specially relied on every other authority (p. 15 ut supra). Archer's nine pages, Wace's name occurs five-and-thirty times, to the virtual exclusion of every other. Who would imagine, from this treatment, that Wace's poem was written a century after the battle, or that Mr. Freeman classed him among 'subsidiary' authorities? But, for the moment, we do not enter into the question of his authority; we simply observe that, of course, no historical student-except Mr. Archer-would dream of relying upon one authority, instead of examining his authorities as a whole. Let us take two examples from Mr. Freeman himself. The case of the battle of Varaville, in 1058, is precisely similar in this respect to that of the battle of Hastings. Of the former Mr. Freeman writes:-

'Wace alone speaks, throughout his narrative, of a bridge. All the other writers speak only of a ford.' (iii. 173.)

Now Wace's authority was better for this, the earlier, battle, because, says Mr. Freeman, he knew the ground. Yet the Professor did not hesitate to reject his 'bridge.' So again, in 'the campaign of Hastings,' Mr. Freeman rejects 'the falsehood of the story of William burning his ships, of which the first traces appear in Wace' (iii. 408). So much for placing our reliance upon Wace, when he stands alone.

Passing now to our next point, the third section of Mr. Archer's paper is devoted to showing 'how the Reviewer's admission of a "fosse" at Hastings, if rightly understood, involves a palisade'; and he begins by observing, with charac-

teristic confidence, that

'the Reviewer might have avoided this [what?] mistake had he only remembered all that is involved in his own admission that 'Harold surrounded his camp with a "fosse" or ditch.'

Now, as the sole passage in which we referred to a ditch is quoted above (see p. 83), it is obviously a sheer misstatement to say that we admitted 'that Harold surrounded his camp with a "fosse"

"fosse" or ditch.' We insisted, on the contrary, that Mr. Freeman himself placed the ditch in the valley to the south, so that it could have nothing to do with the alleged palisade surrounding the camp on the hill. Indeed, we did not even 'admit' the existence of any ditch at all, but merely referred to Mr. Freeman's interpretation of Wace's words. Starting, however, from this misstatement, our critic goes on to argue that if there was a 'fosse' there must have been a vallum—and consequently a palisade:—

'Had the Reviewer only borne in mind this almost invariable connexion between the "fosse" and the wall or palisade that strengthened it, he would hardly have been so positive in his assertion that there were no palisades at Hastings.'

To this we reply:-

0

e

n

d

st

ır

's

d,

C-

he

at

is

to

.

(1) That our article did not admit the existence of the 'fosse,'
(2) That if it did exist, it did not necessarily imply even the existence of a 'vallum.' For Mr. Archer's authority, Wace, describes a precisely similar stratagem (ll. 1737–1760), where all the earth from the artificial ditches was carefully and purposely removed. (3) That even if it had, the 'vallum,' obviously, did not involve the existence of a 'palisade.' Indeed, Mr. Archer's own appeal to 'the citizens' who sat 'sur fossez,' to 'watch the combat' (p. 345), suggests that they would not have impaled themselves for the purpose.* Moreover, when he speaks of a 'vallum or palisade' as if the two were identical, it is sufficient to refer him to Mr. Freeman's remark that 'the palisade could hardly be called a "vallum"' (p. 503). (4) That even if there was a fosse, and if that fosse implied a vallum, and if that vallum was (which is a guess) crowned by a palisade, yet this palisade could not be that which Mr. Freeman mentions.

It is on this last point that we specially take our stand. The only allusion that we made to the fosse—the allusion to which our critic appeals—was made for the sole and express purpose of insisting that, whatever this fosse might be, it could not, on our author's own showing, have anything to do with his 'palisade.' And yet Mr. Archer, knowing this, knowing that even if this fosse were palisaded (which he cannot prove), it could have nothing to do with Mr. Freeman's palisade on the hill—

^{*} One would like to have a reference for Mr. Archer's statement that 'in Wace the citizens of Caen sit "sur fossez" . . . to watch the combat.' The only passage we can find is:—

^{&#}x27;Mult aueit es chans chevaliers E sor fossez gelde e archiers.' (ll. 10,997-8.)

where the men were soldiers, not citizens; where they are not described as sitting; where the scene was Bayeux, not Caen; and where the archers had come to shoot, and not to 'watch the combat.'

the only one in question—coolly states that the existence of the latter is 'involved' in an 'admission' that we never made and in a confusion that we ourselves exposed! That is why we say that he must have known that his arguments were not straightforward.

Our remaining point is that Mr. Archer designedly suppressed Mr. Freeman's allusions to the shield-wall, because they 'would be fatal to his argument.' To prove this we need only turn to the seventh, and principal, section of his paper (pp. 348-351), which deals with the crucial passage in Wace (ll. 7,815-26). Mr. Archer writes:—

'The Reviewer's charge is that . . . Wace's passage refers to the shield-wall and not to a palisade (p. 344). . . . Now there are six distinct objections to translating this passage as if it referred to a shield-wall. These objections are, of course, of unequal value. Their accumulated weight entirely demolishes the Reviewer's argument.' (P. 349.)

We need but confront Mr. Freeman's champion with Mr. Freeman himself, who, in the passage to which we appealed (p. 14), but which he so carefully suppresses, wrote thus of the 'crucial passage,' quoting it in full:—

'Of the array of the shield-wall we have often heard already, as at Maldon (see vol. i. p. 271); but it is at Senlac that we get the fullest descriptions of it, all the better for coming in the mouths of enemies. Wace gives his description:'—(P. 763.)

In other words, the 'Reviewer's charge,' 'the Reviewer's argument,' is that—of Mr. Freeman himself. Although in our previous article (p. 14) we had insisted on the fact that Mr. Freeman himself had explicitly pronounced the disputed passage to be a description of the shield-wall, and had thus freed us from the necessity of discussing it; although Mr. Archer had thus had the fact pressed upon his notice, he found that his only chance of even attempting a reply lay in coolly ignoring a fact in the presence of which his elaborate argument collapses like a house of cards. And to this policy he has continued to adhere. We have now exposed, in these four cases, the character of Mr. Archer's reply.

Turn we then to the sixth section of his defence of Mr. Freeman's views, which is devoted to proving, not that there was not, but that, 'from strategic considerations,' there could not have been a shield-wall along the English front. Reserving for the moment his arguments, we here quote his conclusion:—

'But could the English have ranged a shield-wall along their whole front at Hastings, even if they had wished it?... The English

axeman—and, as William of Malmesbury and Wace both agree, the strength of the English army consisted in its axemen—was shieldless at Hastings, and hence could not have formed the shield-wall even had he desired it. Before these decisive words the Reviewer's theory of an extended shield-wall vanishes like smoke. If Wace is any authority—and the Reviewer does not challenge his authority seriously (he charges Mr. Freeman with misinterpreting him)—the question is settled once and for all. There was no extended shield-wallat Hastings.'

'The Reviewer's theory' here assailed is again, it may surprise our readers to learn, no other than Mr. Freeman's own! Mr. Archer, throughout his paper, carefully suppresses the fact that Mr. Freeman not only insists on the existence of the shieldwall, but distinctly connects it with the 'heavy-armed' axemen. In his description of the battle of Maldon (i. 271), he tells us that—

'the English stood, as at Senlac, in the array common to them and their enemies, a strong line or rather wedge of infantry, forming a wall with their shields.'

So also he writes of Snorro's saga :-

d

r

e

0

X B

r

r. d

e

at

10

of

1-

ır

r.

e

18

ly.

ct

e.

e.

of

e-

3.5

ve

1e

ir

sh

'Some of the incidents in Snorro's account of Stamfordbridge seem very much as if they had been transferred thither from Senlac. The defeat of the Norwegian army, just like that of the English army at Senlac, is owing to their breaking the line of the shield-wall, and Harold the son of Sigurd is killed by the chance shot of an arrow, just like Harold the son of Godwyne.' (P. 732.)

Describing the great battle itself, he reminds us 'that Wace speaks of the effects of the Norman arrows on the English shield-wall' (p. 764); and he writes of the Normans advancing 'up the slope, right in the teeth of Harold's axes, with the shield-wall and the triple palisade still unbroken' (p. 467). At a later stage, 'the shield-wall,' we read, 'was still unbroken' (p. 480). Later still, 'the shield-wall still stood behind the palisade' (p. 487). Even when 'the English palisade was gone, the English shield-wall was still a formidable hindrance in the way of the assailants' (p. 491). And, finally, we have this striking passage:—

'The array of the English was so close that they moved only when they were dead; they stirred not at all while they were alive. The slightly wounded could not escape, but were crushed to death by the thick ranks of their comrades. That is to say, the array of the shield-wall was still kept, though now without the help of the barricades.' (P. 491.)

Similarly, referring to 'the mode of fighting of an English army in that age,' and to 'the usual tactics of the shield-wall,' Mr.

Freeman

Freeman wrote of 'the close array of the battle-axe men' (p. 444). He had already written of 'the English Housecarls with their . . . huge battle-axes,' accustomed to fight in 'the close array of the shield-wall' (ii. 469). We almost hesitate to waste our own and our readers' time on a writer who, professing to vindicate Mr. Freeman's 'view,' as against us, devotes his energies to proving that view to be utterly absurd.

But Mr. Freeman's professed champion, in his attack on our 'imaginary shield-wall' (p. 352), brings forward two arguments against its possible existence. He first insists that in this array the English 'must have been set so close that they could not have used their weapons with any freedom' (p. 346). Now it is precisely this close array on which Mr. Oman, as a specialist, insists in his 'Art of War in the Middle Ages':—

'The tactics of the English axemen were those of the column: arranged in a compact mass, they could beat off almost any attack. . . . If assailed by horsemen, they were obliged to halt and remain fixed to the spot, in order to keep off the enemy by their close order.' (P. 24.)

It was this also that struck so vividly those who saw them in the battle. Thus William of Poitiers, an authority of the first rank, describes the English as 'maxime conferti,' and proceeds to dwell on the terrible effect of their weapons. Mr. Freeman was fully alive to this salient fact. He not only dwells upon it, as above, but pictures

'the immovable wedge of men which, as if fixed to the ground by nature, covered every inch of the hill. . . . Up the slopes, through the barricades, the enemy had to make their way in the teeth of ranks of men, ranged so closely together in the thick array of the shieldwall, that while they only kept their ground, the success of an assailant was hopeless.' (P. 471.)

This, and not 'the Reviewer's theory,' is the picture which, according to Mr. Freeman's champion, now 'vanishes like smoke'!

The second 'strategical consideration' advanced by Mr. Archer is ut supra—

'that the English axeman—and, as William of Malmesbury and Wace both agree, the strength of the English army consisted in its axemen —was shieldless at Hastings, and hence could not have formed the shield-wall, even had he desired it.'

No one disputes that 'the strength of the English army consisted in its axemen.' But were they 'shieldless'? Our critic relies on two passages: one from Wace, which he himself renders, 'he [the axeman] could not cover himself with his shield [sic]

n'

ls

he

to

ng

is

ur

is

ld

W

a

n:

k.

in

r.

in

he

br

Ir.

ly

by

gh

ks

d-

nt

h,

ke

Ir.

ce

en

he

ed

es

c

if he wanted to strike a free blow' (p. 348); the other from William of Malmesbury, in which that writer asserts, not only that the axemen had shields, but that with them they formed the shield-wall! We quoted this passage prominently in our article, italicising the words thus:—

'Pedites omnes cum bipennibus, conserta ante se scutorum testudine, impenetrabilem cuneum faciunt.'

Yet Mr. Archer actually appeals to this very passage in support of his views, writing:—

'William of Malmesbury here is in accord with Wace: "Pedites omnes . . . cum bipennibus," etc., as the "Quarterly" reviewer cites the passage.'

Here, it will be seen, Mr. Archer proves that the axemen were 'shieldless'—by simply omitting and suppressing the words which describe their 'shield-wall'! And he is equally careful to omit the words which describe their 'impenetrabilem cuneum' and their 'confertos manipulos.' So, too, he appeals to this passage from Wace:—

'al col l'escu.

Granz haches tindrent en lor cols

Donc il quident ferir granz cols;

A pie furent serrement.' (Il. 7,996-9.)

But the only words he quotes from it are (we keep his own quotation marks): 'great hatchets on their necks, with which they could strike doughty blows' (p. 347). Yet the words that we have italicised prove that, according to Wace himself, axemen, of course, had shields, and that they fought in close order. Mr. Archer holds that they could not have done so; we must really refer him, in this matter, to his own authorities and his own master.

As we shall come to another passage in which 'the shieldless axemen' are alluded to, it may be well to examine the point in some detail. Now, it is a really extraordinary fact that we are not left to conjecture for the equipment of these famous axemen: the housecarl, armed for war, has been painted for us as he stood. Mr. Freeman must here, as elsewhere, have forgotten a fact recorded by himself; Mr. Archer, it is charitable to suppose, had never even heard of it. Let us take the former's own rendering of the words of Florence of Worcester (A.D. 1040):—

'Each soldier bore on his left arm a shield with gilded boss and studs; his right arm bore the javelin, the English ategar, for the distant skirmishing at the beginning of a battle. But each, too, was ready for the closest and most terrible fight. Each was girded with

a sword with a gilded handle, and from each man's left shoulder hung, also adorned with gold and silver, the most fearful weapon of all, the Danish battle-axe. This is our first mention of the weapon which Englishmen were, twenty-six years later, to wield with such deadly prowess upon the heights of Senlac.'

Turn from this to the Bayeux Tapestry, to the first fighting Englishman it shows us on 'the heights of Senlac.' On his left arm he bears his shield; with his right he wields his javelin at this beginning of the battle. But he is also 'girded with a sword,' and on his left shoulder we see 'the Danish battle-axe.' There is no more wondrous witness to the accuracy of our priceless record than this which Mr. Freeman ignores. But not only is the first Englishman thus depicted, as if a type, with his panoply in complete detail: Harold himself, in the famous death-scene, is shown us twice over with lance, sword, and shield, and then, immediately afterwards, with the battle-axe falling from his grasp. The artist has thus succeeded in

giving us his whole armament.

Mr. Freeman himself, of course, was too familiar with his subject to go far astray in his equipment of the English 'heavy-armed.' They all, he holds, had shields and javelins; but while 'some still kept the ancient broad-sword most of them bore the long-handled axe' (pp. 473, 765). We, on the contrary, hold (ut supra) that they could bear both weapons. Compared with this slight difference, Mr. Archer, we shall find, is wholly at sea, and, ignoring Mr. Freeman altogether, speaks of the English who fought 'with spear [i.e. javelin] and buckler' as quite distinct from the 'axemen.' We have already disposed of his assertion that 'the English axeman was shieldless at Hastings,' and we are not called upon to do more. There are two groups, however, in the Tapestry to which Under 'ceciderunt qui erant cum we would call attention. Haroldo' two axemen are shown fighting: one strikes with the shorter axe while covering himself with his shield; the other wields with both his hands the largest axe seen in the battle, and yet has a shield, and has made use of it, for in it are sticking the Norman arrows. This proves that, in spite of Mr. Archer, it was possible for the man so armed to use a shield. The second group is that which follows immediately on Harold's death. It may possibly give us the clue to the way in which the twohanded axe was used in connexion with the shield-wall. Two of the housecarls are using that weapon, while two others seem to be protecting them by standing in front of them with shield and sword. The front rank then may have used their swords and formed the shield-wall, while those behind them may LOWER A

have wielded their axes, enabled to do so by their great length. This, we believe, is a novel suggestion, but it does not profess to be more. The fact of the 'close array' is certain: the details

must be matter of conjecture.

The difficulties presented to our critic by the array of the shield-wall were perfectly familiar to Mr. Freeman, but did not, as we have seen, prevent him from insisting on its existence. It is only Mr. Archer to whom authorities are nothing, and who, because an historic fact presents difficulties to his own mind, can airily write that 'the question is settled once and for all: there was no extended shield-wall at Hastings.'

Truly the shade of Mr. Freeman might pray to be delivered

from his friends.

οf

n

h

is

n

a

.,

ar

ut

e,

1e

d,

e-

in

is

sh

s ;

st

5).

th

er.

an.

.e.

Ve

an

do

ch

he

er

nd

ng er,

nd

It

70-

wo

em

eld

rds

ave

We now turn to Mr. Archer's treatment of the evidence of the Bayeux Tapestry. This, 'the most authentic record of that day's fight,' as Mr. Freeman himself terms it, shows us the 'scutorum testudo' with almost painful fidelity, while, as we wrote (p. 15), 'it will be searched in vain for a palisade, or for anything faintly resembling it, from beginning to end of the battle.' Now this, it is needful to remember, is no mere negative evidence. 'The Bayeux Tapestry,' Mr. Freeman insisted (p. 575), 'shows Harold's army at Senlac as Harold's army really was': it is therefore positive evidence of the aspect that army presented. Mr. Archer seems to be aware of this, for, instead of seeking to impugn its testimony, he endeavours to reconcile it with Mr. Freeman's views and with his own interpretation of Wace.

Mr. Archer's defence is characteristic; it consists in adapting, as usual, his facts to his requirements. He argues thus:—

'Such a theory is not at variance with the evidence of the Tapestry. The barricades may or not have covered the whole army; but in any case we may suppose that they were more carefully constructed in front of the shieldless axemen; while they may have been less elaborate, or altogether absent, where the English soldier fought—as in the Tapestry we see him fight—with spear and buckler. The two accounts do not contradict; they supplement each other.' (P. 351.)

That is to say, Wace's description applies exclusively to the 'shieldless' portion of the front; while the Tapestry depicts, with equal exclusiveness, that (ex hypothesi) small portion of the army which was provided with shields. Thus 'the two accounts supplement each other'; and the absence of any palisade in the Tapestry is accounted for first by the fact that it did not extend in front of troops with shields, and secondly by the fact that the Tapestry omits all other portions of the army.

Unluckily for this ingenious, but not ingenuous, suggestion,

it is not only absolutely without foundation, but is directly opposed to Mr. Freeman's theory, and indeed to his express statements. In the first place, Wace's words apply (whatever defence they are meant to indicate) to the English army as a whole (Il. 7,824-7,830). In the second place, Mr. Freeman's palisade protects, no less distinctly, the whole English front (pp. 447, 471, 472, &c.). In the third place he most distinctly asserts that it stood in front of troops with shields, and indeed of 'the shield-wall' itself. In the fourth place, according to him (and, as we have seen, to excellent authorities), the axemen were not 'shieldless' (supra, p. 91). In the fifth place, it is not only 'with spear and buckler' that 'we see' the English fighting in the Tapestry, the 'javelins' being merely, according to Mr. Freeman, used 'to hurl at the beginning of the action,' while the real weapons of those who used them were the axe and the sword (p. 473).

The essential point is that Mr. Freeman, in direct contradiction to Mr. Archer's suggestion, insists on the existence of the

palisade in front of the line of shields :-

'The shield-wall still stood behind the palisade' (p. 487).....
'The impenetrable fortress of timber, shields, and living warriors' (p. 479).... 'Through the barricades the enemy had to make their way in the teeth of men ranged so closely together in the thick array of the shield-wall' (p. 471), &c.

We see then that Mr. Archer, in his desperate attempt to harmonize Mr. Freeman's statements with the evidence of the Bayeux Tapestry, is driven, characteristically, to suppress the fact that the historian places his palisade in front of the shield-wall itself, and that his own suggested compromise thus 'vanishes like smoke.'

Hitherto we have met with nothing new in Mr. Archer's evidence. We now come to the one actual bit of testimony that his article brings forward and that Mr. Freeman did not. He devotes his fourth section to 'four passages where Wace speaks distinctly of a "Lice," i.e. a palisade.' In spite of the large print in which this announcement was made, we find that only three instances can actually be adduced. Our critic, it is true, begins by asserting that 'Harold, we read, had carefully chosen (porpris) his ground for the battle and surrounded it with "lists" (p. 345). But, on referring to Wace for this first passage, we find nothing of the kind. Harold, we read,—

'Un champ out par matin porpris, Ou il a toz ses Engleis mis Par matin les fist toz armer E a bataille conreer.' (ll. 7,769-72.) tly

ess

ver

a

n's

ont

tly

eed to

nen

18 ish

ing

on,

and

lic-

the

ors'

heir

niek

to

the

the

eld-

shes

er's

ony

not.

ace

the

that

it is

ully

with

first

But

But there is here no mention of 'lists' or 'lices,' or of any other defence. Indeed, in this passage, Wace implies that Harold, so far from having fortified his ground, had only 'chosen' it at the last moment. Of the only two passages in which the word occurs, one (l. 7,010) is a 'legend,' than which, says Mr. Freeman, 'nothing can be less trustworthy' (p. 449), while the other -the only one in Wace's narrative of the battle (Il. 8,585-92) occurs among the exploits of the various Norman nobles, and not in the general description of the fight.

Now our reply in this matter of the 'lices' is perfectly simple and conclusive. We did not refer to them, because Mr. Freeman did not give them among his authorities for the palisade, and did not even mention them. As he, avowedly, mentioned his authorities for every statement that he made (supra, p. 83), we took him at his word, and examined his statements, as he himself wished, in the light of the authorities he gave. But as Mr. Archer goes, on the contrary, outside those authorities and drags in the 'lices,' he compels us to point out that the passage on which he specially relies-

> 'E cil ont les espees traites, Les lices ont totes desfaites, E li Engleis par grant dehait Se sunt a l'estandart retrait' (11. 8,589-92)—

is, so far from confirmatory, destructive of Mr. Freeman's views. On no point is he more positive than that the standard, with Harold at its foot, stood, throughout the day, in the very forefront of the fight (pp. 447, 474, 475, 476, 483, 484, 487, 492), and that Harold fought at the 'barricade' like 'a private soldier.' To suggest that he and his standard remained in the rear, while his followers fought and died for him at the front, till forced to retreat to the standard,-would have seemed to Harold's champion little short of blasphemy.

We have, we hope, now shown that Mr. Archer can only appeal to Wace's mention of 'lices' (ll. 8,585-92) at the cost of throwing over Mr. Freeman's 'conception of the battle.' That the historian himself omitted, on this ground, to allude to them, we should think it unfair to allege. But, as a matter of fact, he did not allude to them; and we were therefore more loyal than our critic to his memory, in following the example he

We are not, therefore, called upon to reply to a passage which our critic can only appeal to at the cost of throwing Mr. Freeman over. But we may point out that mounted Normans would not and could not have destroyed with 'swords' the

'wooden walls' of Mr. Freeman's 'fortress,' or the 'twisted boughs and logs' of Mr. Archer's 'barricade' (p. 350). Their swords were for men, not for 'timber'; and it was 'the infantry,' according to Mr. Freeman (p. 467), who would have 'to break down the palisades.' To this we may add that according to the Professor (p. 495), 'there was no artificial defence' left between the English and their foes at a stage of the battle earlier by 300 lines than that at which alone these 'lices' appear.

As to the solitary allusion to 'pel' that Mr. Archer quotes from Wace's account of the battle (l. 8,499), he himself renders the word, not 'palisade,' but 'stake' (p. 345), which, we may add, is by far its most usual meaning in the *Roman*. Indeed, the 'granz pels' (l. 7,727) which the rustics fought with in the battle are rightly rendered by Mr. Freeman, 'sharp stakes.'

We shall scarcely be expected to reply to Mr. Archer's 'corroborative evidence from other sources,' which dwindles down to one line, 'tending in the same direction' (p. 346), from Benoît de St. Maur, who does not speak of a palisade, and to whom, if he did, no one would pay much attention. But what are we to say to the passages in Wace's rendering of the 'Brut,' that Mr. Archer produces 'to cap all' (p. 351)? The champion of Wace's accuracy and unimpeacheable authority quotes in triumph his minute description of King Arthur's military operations as 'an exact parallel to his account of Hastings' (p. 352). It must be obvious to any rational being that if Wace could thus minutely describe the operations of mythical Britons, it only shows how free a scope he gave to the inventive faculty; while the parallel Mr. Archer relies on can of course only prove, not that the descriptions were both true, but that they were equally worthless.

We have now exhausted the new evidence brought forward by our critic, and may thus sum up the case as regards the Roman de Rou. Even if Wace, clearly and consistently, mentioned a palisade throughout his account of the battle, we should certainly reject the statement of a witness writing a century after it, when we find him at variance with every authority (for that is our point), just as Mr. Freeman rejected the bridge at Varaville, or the 'falsehood' of the burning of the ships, or the 'blunder' of making the Duke land at Hastings, or his anachronisms, or his chronology. For 'of course,' in the Professor's own words, 'whenever he [Wace] departs from contemporary authority, and merely sets down floating traditions nearly a hundred years after the latest events which he records, his statements need to be very carefully weighed.' But, as a

matter

matter of fact, Wace is not consistent. He can himself have formed no clear idea of the battle. For instance, in this matter of the 'palisade' his own narrative, as a whole, is inconsistent with its existence. Thus in the opening scene, where it ought to have been specially prominent, when 'the French infantry,' in Mr. Freeman's words, 'had to toil up the hill, and to break down the palisade' (p. 477), there is no mention in Wace of any defence of the kind. On the contrary, indeed, he here describes the English as at times retreating before the Normans, and the Normans, in turn, as pursued by the English (Il. 8,075-8), which is incompatible with the opposing forces being divided by 'wooden walls,' behind which, on the English side, 'not a man,' says Mr. Freeman, 'had swerved' (p. 480). It is true that the historian supports his view by thus paraphrasing Wace: 'The Normans shouted "God help us!" the English, from behind their barricades, mocked with cries of "Out, out!" every foe who entered or strove to enter' (p. 478). But, in the original, we only read-

'Normant escrient: "Deus aie!"
La gent englesche "ut, ut!" escrie.
Co est l'enseigne que io di,
Quant Engleis saillent hors a cri.' (ll. 8,079-82.)

Mr. Freeman has simply interpolated the words 'from behind their barricades'; and this is an instance of what we meant when we spoke of his 'imaginary' allusions to the palisade. But this is by no means all. The gloss which he has put on the 'ut! ut!' of the English is at direct variance with Wace's own explanation. The last two lines of the quatrain, which Mr. Freeman omitted, tell us that this was the cry which the English raised when in pursuit. It was, in short, their old 'Hutesium' (or 'Uthesium') which they raised, as Wace states, when in pursuit of criminals. The writ for providing watch and ward, issued in 1252, gives us excellent examples of its use:—

'Tunc prædicti vigiles hutesium levent super eos undique, et eum insequantur cum tota villata et vicinis villatis, cum clamore et hutesio de villa in villam donec capiantur.'

And, now leaving the 'palisade,' we turn to what we described in our article as 'our second point, the disposition of the English forces.'

As we are charged with having 'quite misapprehended Mr. Freeman's ideas,' it becomes necessary to quote in extenso the actual words we used:—

'The one and only point that is certain is that "on the very crown of the hill," the site of the high altar in the future, was Vol. 177.—No. 353.

erected the standard of Harold. This, then, the centre of the hill, was the centre of the English host. But the ground to which our attention is directed, as having "really played the most decisive part in the great event of the place," lay to the west of this, "where the slope is gentlest of all, where the access to the natural citadel is least difficult." Mr. Freeman assumes that this ground—the "English right," as he terms it-where "the ascent is easiest in itself," was allotted to "the least trustworthy portion of the English army," to "the sudden levies of the southern shires." For this assumption, we basten to add, there is no authority whatever. He further assumes that the first English to leave their post, in pursuit of the enemy, "were, of course, some of the defenders of the English right." William, he holds, at the crisis of the battle, resolved to draw them again from their post by a partial feigned retreat, that "meanwhile another division might reach the summit through the gap thus left open." Accordingly, tempted by this stratagem, "the English on the right wing rushed down and pursued," and their error proved "fatal to England."

"The Duke's great object was now gained; the main end of Harold's skilful tactics had been frustrated by the inconsiderate ardour of the least valuable portion of his troops. Through the rash descent of the light-armed on the right, the whole English army lost its vantage-ground. The pursuing English had left the most easily accessible portion of the hill open to the approach of the enemy. . . The main body of the Normans made their way on to the hill, no doubt by the gentle slope at the point west of the present buildings. The great advantage of the ground was now lost; the Normans were at last on the hill."

'Such is Mr. Freeman's explanation of how the battle was won; for in this episode he discovers the decisive turning-point of the day.'

This summary of Mr. Freeman's views was written with extreme care: every quotation on which it is based can be verified by our readers for themselves; and if they should still consider the closing words too strong, we confront them with his own summary of the battle, in which we find this sentence:—

'The battle was lost [sic] through the error of those light-armed troops, who, in disobedience to the King's orders, broke their line to pursue.' (P. 505.)

Yet Mr. Archer (the italics are his own) coolly replies that, according to Mr. Freeman, 'the battle was not won at this part of the field, but at the centre.' To say that the battle was 'lost,' is also to say that it was won; and it was 'lost,' according to Mr. Freeman himself, exactly as we wrote,

We pass, therefore, to the next matter in which we are charged with misapprehension. Mr. Archer claims to be

rauma on a reactival de l'

informed.

'on very good authority, that the Reviewer seems to have quite misapprehended Mr. Freeman's ideas as to the position of the unarmed [sic] troops and the effect of their rout upon the fortunes of the day.'

We

r

9

9

el

10

in

10

or

r.

in

he

le,

ed

nit

nis nd

ful

ble

ht. had

the

, no

reat

n;

ay.

rith

be

till

rith

:--

med

e to

hat,

part

ost,

g to

are

) be

mis-

rmed

We

lay.

We may safely leave it to our readers to say whether the extracts we have already given do not justify us up to the hilt in what we have said of Mr. Freeman's ideas on the 'rout' of the light-armed [not 'unarmed'] troops, as he terms them, and of its effect 'upon the fortunes of the day.' As to their 'position,' the extracts we have given reproduce most faithfully Mr. Freeman's view that they were posted on 'the English right' (pp. 472, 475, 480, 490). But, continues Mr. Archer-

'Harold, according to Mr. Freeman, did not leave his rude levies on the right exposed to the full fury of the Norman onset. Mr. Freeman distinctly states that these raw levies were protected by a small hill on which Harold had set (regular) troops, and by a ravine. (This ravine the Reviewer does not mention at all; the hill he relegates to a footnote.*) So that the Reviewer's remarks on Harold's incapable generalship fall to the ground.'

This passage contains what we fear can only be described as two separate misstatements. Mr. Freeman, in describing the spot 'where the access to the natural citadel is least difficult '(p. 446) and 'the ascent is easiest in itself' (p. 475), does mention the small hill—a point which we duly noted and replied to—but does not mention the 'ravine' as defending this approach, for the excellent reason that it did not do so, lying as it did, according to him, not in front of the English, but on their right rear (see his ground-plan). The second misstatement is that 'Harold had set,' according to Mr. Freeman, 'regular troops' on the small hill. Mr. Freeman refers, so far as we can find, five times in all (pp. 446, 475-6, 480, 489, 770) to this 'small outlying hill.' On no occasion does he describe it as held by regular -or as he terms them 'heavy-armed'-troops, while a comparison of p. 480 with p. 489 shows that he drew no distinction between its defenders and the 'light-armed' levies who formed the English right. Indeed, he writes of the hill, in the latter passage :-

' Either its defenders had never left it, or a party of the fugitives contrived to rally and occupy it. At all events it was held and gallantly defended by a body of light-armed English.

'The scene is vividly shown in the Tapestry (Pl. 15), and the defenders of the little hill are all light-armed.'

It should be added that the existence of an 'outpost' on the hill—even of 'light-armed' rustics—is avowedly nothing but a guess of Mr. Freeman's, a guess which we duly rejected (p. 17), as not merely without foundation but without even probability.

^{*} The words here within brackets are found in a footnote.

[†] This second paragraph will be found in the appendant footnote. н 2

Such is the flimsy and misleading criticism on the strength of which Mr. Archer asserts that 'the Reviewer's remarks on Harold's incapable generalship fall to the ground.' Moreover, he does not even quote the actual remarks we made. But we will do so:—

'Harold's skilful tactics, we find, consisted in entrusting his weakest point, the least defensible portion of his position, to "the least trustworthy portion of the English army."... The generalship of Harold was shown by entrusting to his worst troops his weakest and most important point, while posting "the flower of the English army" just where his ground was strongest.'

These 'remarks' rest on Mr. Freeman's own statements: their accuracy is absolutely unshaken by Mr. Archer's criticism; and his claim that they 'fall to the ground' will evoke nothing but a smile.

Mr. Archer's closing words on this portion of the subject are these:—

'The culminating point of the battle was not the turning of this [right] wing, which was not turned at all in any special sense, but only shared the general flight after the defeat of the centre.' (P. 353.)

Here, as usual, our critic garbles our words. We did not describe the episode on the right as the 'culminating' point of the battle: we wrote (ut supra) that in it Mr. Freeman 'discovers the decisive turning-point of the day.' The scrupulous exactitude with which these words reproduce Mr. Freeman's view is shown (apart from the extracts we have already given) by his own words when dealing with 'this great advantage.' He writes: 'The day had now turned decidedly in favour of the invaders' (p. 491).

Lastly, as to the fate of the right wing, Mr. Archer forgets that he had just before spoken of the 'rout' of the light-armed troops who composed it; and how complete that 'rout' had been (according to Mr. Freeman's theory) is seen from the statement that 'the main body of the Normans' actually occupied the ground it had held, and 'instead of having to cut their way up the slope and through the palisades, they could now charge to the east right against the defenders of the Standard' (p. 490). These words are most important. They set forth Mr. Freeman's theory that Harold now found the Normans charging down upon his right flank, instead of attacking him in front. It was in this sense we wrote 'that his weak point was forced and the English right turned,' as the natural result of the 'insane tactics' (p. 17) attributed to him

by

by his champion. The manœuvre assigned, by Mr. Freeman, to the Duke is, in fact, that by which Marlborough won the battle of Ramillies, where he got on to the hill by dislodging the French right, and then wheeled to his own right, outflanking the French centre. It is difficult, of course, for a civilian to say whether his language is technically correct from a military standpoint or not; he can only strive to make his meaning clear; and a critic who insists on using 'strategical' where he ought to have used 'tactical,' is, one would have thought, the last man to set him right on such a point.

S

18

:

;

g

re

nis

ut

e.

rot

of

is-

ous

n's

en) ge.'

the

rets

ned had

the

cut

the

the

his

the

by

of

Leaving Mr. Freeman's apologist, and turning to the historian himself, we cannot insist too strongly that, as we originally wrote, 'there is no authority whatever' (p. 16) 'there is absolutely no evidence for Mr. Freeman's assumption that the English right was entrusted to the raw levies' (p. 18). Analogy is here our only guide, and analogy, as we showed (pp. 18, 19), is wholly against any such supposition. The fact is, that Mr. Freeman himself seems to have had no clear idea of what he meant to convey. In the original preface to his third volume he drew attention to its 'accurate military ground-plan of the battle-field, of which he wrote:—

'The relative position of the different divisions in the two armies seems beyond doubt, but the extent of ground occupied by each division must be matter of pure conjecture. The one absolutely certain point is the position of the English standard, and the fact that it was against that point that the main attack under William himself was made.'

With the latter proposition, as we said, we cordially concur. It is 'the one and only point that is certain' (p. 16). But, on turning to the 'accurate' ground-plan, we find the English army drawn up in three divisions, the 'housecarls' forming the centre, and the 'light-armed' the two wings. When Mr. Freeman wrote that this arrangement was 'beyond doubt,' he must have forgotten, for the moment, that it was nothing but a guess of his own; that there was no evidence for any such arrangement, no evidence even that the 'light-armed' formed separate 'divisions' at all, or indeed that the English army was drawn up, as depicted, in line. It might, for all we know, have formed a crescent or semicircle, its wings resting strongly on the rear-slopes of the hill; or a 'wedge'-as Mr. Freeman in one place speaks of it (p. 471)—with the King at its apex. For ourselves, we look on these formations as quite as probable, if not more so; but all we insist on is that Mr. Freeman's formation rests solely on conjecture.

But quite apart from the question of formation, the arrange-

ment of the 'light-armed' in separate divisions, one forming the right and the other the left wing, is, we must again repeat, a sheer guess. Indeed, vividly as it is shown in the 'accurate' ground-plan, there is not in the narrative even an assertion as to the constitution of the left wing. Nor is the narrative itself quite consistent in its statements. A careful comparison of pp. 472, 473, 490, and 505 with the ground-plan will show that the right wing, including its fighting front, was composed of 'light-armed troops, who broke their line to pursue.' On the other hand, pp. 471, 480, 487, and 732 as undoubtedly convey the impression that, as we ourselves maintained, the heavy-armed English, with their shields, 'were extended along the whole front '(p. 19), and that the defeat, in Mr. Freeman's words (p. 732), was 'owing to their breaking the line of the shield-wall.' We suspect that the historian was led thus to contradict himself by the obvious concentration of his interest on 'the great personal struggle which was going on beneath the Standard.' But more serious is the glaring contradiction to which we invited attention on p. 19. Mr. Freeman had formed the conjectures embodied in his ground-plan without bearing in mind, as he had proposed to do, the disposition of the English forces at the battle of Sherstone. Discovering this too late, he inserted a footnote in his second edition (p. 472) appealing to 'the tactics of Eadmund at Sherstone' as a precedent for 'placing the inferior troops in the rear' (sic), as they were probably placed, according to us, by Harold. But he had, in the meanwhile, committed himself to the view that they formed at the battle of Hastings, not the rear, but (see ground-plan) two-thirds of the whole fighting front. No contradiction could be more complete.

The charge therefore that we brought, on this point, against the historian, was that his disposition of the English forces, with all that it involves, was based on no authority, was merely the offspring of his own imagination, and was directly at variance with the only precedent that he vouched for the purpose. To this charge, which surely is serious and definite enough, Mr. Archer has not even attempted to reply. He contents himself with asserting that the assumption of the palisade 'is the only definite and palpable charge that the Reviewer brings against Mr. Freeman's account of the great battle' (p. 353), and he therein states, once more, what is contrary to the truth. To prove this, we need only refer to the opening page of his own article (p. 334), in which he admits that we charged Mr. Freeman with being 'wrong, above all things else, in his distribution of the English troops.' Quite

so; and that charge still awaits a reply.

We have now established, briefly to recapitulate, that Mr. Freeman is, even on his own showing, wrong in assuming that the English fought behind 'wooden walls,' and that his 'palisade,' with all that it involves, must be finally abandoned. We have further shown that his elaborate and confident arrangement of the English forces rests on no authority, and is nothing but a random guess,—a guess to which his own precedent, moreover, is directly opposed. Then passing to the battle, and taking it stage by stage, we have shown that on its opening phase he went utterly astray, in search of an imaginary attack on a phantom palisade. We have seen how another such guess transported to 'the western ravine' a catastrophe which cannot have happened there; and we have traced, in our former article, his singular misapprehension of the great feigned flight. Lastly, the critical manœuvre of the day, by which 'the Duke's great object was gained,' and 'the great advantage of the ground lost' to the English, proves, on enquiry—although introduced, like the other assertions, as an historic fact—to be yet another unsupported guess: for the statement that, by this manœuvre, 'the Normans were at last on the hill,' and could thus 'charge to the east right against the defenders of the Standard' (p. 490), there is absolutely no foundation.

What then remains, it may be asked, of Mr. Freeman's narrative? When one remembers its superb vividness, carrying us away in spite of ourselves, one is tempted to reply, in

his own words on the saga of Stamfordbridge:-

'We have, indeed, a glorious description which, when critically examined, proves to be hardly more worthy of belief than a battle-piece in the Iliad. . . Such is the magnificent legend which has been commonly accepted as the history of this famous battle. . . And it is disappointing that, for so detailed and glowing a tale, we have so little of authentic history to substitute.' (Pp. 365-8.)

For, as he has so justly observed, when dismissing as 'mythical' this 'famous and magnificent saga' (pp. 328-98), 'a void is left which history cannot fill, and which it is forbidden to the historian to fill up from the resources of his own imagination.'

It is Mr. Freeman's own champion who admits, of the charges

we have made, that

3

1

e

e

١,

f

e

.

,

t

e

e

e

e

e

t

e

ts

n

te

e

'such a contention, it will at once be perceived, is very different from any mere criticism of detail; it affects the centre and the very heart of Mr. Freeman's work. If he could blunder here in the most carefully elaborated passage of his whole history, he could blunder anywhere; his reputation for accuracy would be gone almost beyond hope of retrieving it.' (P. 336.)

Blunder,

'Blunder,' surely, is a harsh word. We would rather say that the historian is seen here at his strongest and at his weakest: at his weakest in his tendency to follow blindly individual authorities in turn, instead of grasping them as a whole, and, worse still, in adapting them, at need, to his own preconceived notions; at his strongest, in his Homeric power of making the actors in his drama live and move before us. Not in vain has 'the wand of the enchanter,' as an ardent admirer once termed it, been waved around Harold and his host. We are learning from recent German researches how the narratives of early Irish warfare are 'perfectly surrounded with magic'; how, for instance, at the battle of Culdreimne 'a Druid wove a magic hedge, which he placed before the army as a hindrance to the enemy.' But spells are now no longer wrought

'With woven paces and with waving hands;'

and the Druid's hedge must go the way of our own magician's 'palisade.'

Mr. Archer selected for his closing words those of 'our greatest Englishman of the seventeenth century.' It is of Milton's words that we also are, by his tactics, reminded:—

'What though the field be lost?
All is not lost; th' unconquerable will,
And study of revenge, immortal hate,
And courage never to submit or yield.'

Judging, however, from his own attempt, the prospect of more such vengeance need not greatly appal us. There rises before us, in the twilight, a vision of the hill of battle. As the Conqueror holds high revel among the dying and the dead—

'Mult ont Engleis grant dol eu Del rei Heraut qu'il ont perdu, E del duc qui aueit vencu Qui l'estandart out abatu.'

'Sire,' exclaims his faithful friend, 'beware of the fury of your foes, maddened by their leader's fall':—

'mult se quident ainz vengier E mult se quident vendre chier.'

But the Conqueror sits unmoved.

For us, too, the fight is over: and so, like the Duke, as the darkness fell, we sheathe once more our sword, claiming, in the phrase Mr. Freeman loved, that we have possession of the place of slaughter.

ART. IV.—National Life and Character: a Forecast. By Charles H. Pearson, LL.D., late Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford, and sometime Minister of Education in Victoria. London, 1893.

SPECULATIONS concerning the future are probably confined to man alone. It was better animals that, as Milton said, 'they reason not contemptibly.' But it can hardly be that they possess that intellectual faculty of reflection, that μνήμη συνθετική, of which man makes such With his 'large discourse looking before and vast use. after,' man seeks to peer beyond the narrow limits of the actual. Nor is it merely with the coming events of our own personal existence that our minds are, from time to time, occupied. 'Noman liveth to himself.' And there are few thoughtful persons who do not now and then try to picture how 'when the years have passed away,' and we have passed away with them, it will fare with our children, our country, 'the great globe itself.' Of course our prognostications are largely shaped and coloured by our principles, our predilections, our prejudices. 'Fast rushing to total anarchy and self-government by the basest,' was-Mr. Carlyle's judgment of the 'paltry dog kennel of a world' which he beheld around him. On the other hand, Mr. Herbert Spencer has expressed the conviction that 'the future has in store forms of social life higher than any we have imagined'; 'a faith transcending that of the Radical, whose aim is some reorganization admitting of comparison to organizations that exist." M. Renan, in one of the most curious of his 'Philosophical Dialogues,' dreams of an oligarchical solution of the problem of the universe, when the élite of intelligent beings, possessing the most important secrets of reality, shall dominate the world by the potent instruments of destruction of which their science has given them the absolute disposal, and shall cause as muchreason as possible to reign there ('et y ferait régner le plus de raison possible'). While the author of the popular work 'Looking Backward,' which we suppose may be regarded as a Socialistic Apocalypse, assures us that with the national assumption of all capital, and the national organization of all labour, the race will rise 'to a new plane of existence, with an illimitable vista of progress,' moral, intellectual, and material: and this millennium, he assures us, in all seriousness, is but 'fifty years ahead.' For the most recent forecast we are indebted to Mr. Pearson, whose work on 'National Life and Character' isentitled to more than a cursory notice. The object of it, he tells us, is 'to indicate, in a very general way, the direction to which

e

ur

he

he

ce

T.

which we are drifting in political and social life': to point out what is likely to happen if we go on for two hundred years more as we have gone on for the last three quarters of a century.' Mr. Pearson admits that history abounds in memorable examples of the rash forecasts made by men whose genius and experience entitled their opinions to the highest respect. But he gives instances where remote and generally unexpected changes have been prophesied with considerable accuracy. And while he allows that it is seldom possible to divine the immediate future, he thinks it 'justifiable to say that in a certain broad and vague way the tendency of the times may be, and constantly is, appreciated,' and that there is 'a limited power of forecasting the general trend of human progress.' He does not contend that this power can be of any real use in influencing events, or that any human sagacity can avert the fatality of our acts for centuries past, or of our characters as we inherit or have fashioned them. He urges, however, that if we cannot change manifest destiny, we may, at least, adapt ourselves to it, and make it endurable: nay, more, that if we cannot transform the future, we may to some extent shape it. Such is the spirit in which Mr. Pearson enters upon his prophetic office. His qualifications for it are large knowledge both of the past and present of human action and human thought, an unusual power of stating and marshalling facts, and a lively and luminous diction. Some quarter of a century ago he won a respectable place in contemporary literature by a 'History of England in the Early and Middle Ages,' in which he made full proof of careful and conscientious research. For twenty years he has resided in Victoria, and has warmly interested himself in the political and social problems of that colony, where he once held the office of Minister of Public Instruction; and he thinks that the experiments made by self-governing British colonies for the solution of these problems are noteworthy, as indicating what we may expect in the future. Such are Mr. Pearson's claims to a hearing. And now we shall, in the first place, put before our readers, as far as possible in his own words, the chief features of his speculations, and then indicate our own views regarding them.

The thought of writing this book, Mr. Pearson tells us, was suggested to him by his conviction that the United States of America are filling up more rapidly than is supposed in England, and will cease, within measurable time, to offer any great inducements to a large immigration. The day cannot be far distant when the population of the United States must reach 60,000,000, and the Americans will begin to be cramped for land. What then is to become of the eager and impetuous

element

element that has hitherto poured into that country from the overpeopled nations of Europe? It is very often assumed that the higher races of men, or those which are held to have attained the highest forms of civilization, are bound to gain more and more upon the lower. We are perpetually reminded that countries which, until now, were supposed to be unfit for European colonists, will really allow them to multiply and prosper, if they will only comply with such reasonable conditions as the climate exacts. But is this so, in truth? Or is not the capacity of European races to form new homes for themselves narrowly limited by climate and by the circumstances of prior populations? Are there not certain unchangeable limits of higher races? That is the initial question which Mr. Pearson considers. Now, in the first place, it is quite evident that China and India and the greater part of the African Continent are not possible fields for European colonization. But it is widely believed that at all events Central Africa, now so sparsely populated by blacks, offers a magnificent outlet to the teeming millions of Europe. Mr. Pearson holds this belief unwarranted. The Cape Colony, he points out, is not predominantly white, though settled under the most favourable conditions, while Natal is already not a white man's colony, and is bound to pass more and more into the hands of the coloured races. And what has happened in Natal, Mr. Pearson judges, may be expected to happen in Africa generally. Its fate is bound to be the fate of those parts of the African Continent which lie to the north of it, and to the south of the desert of Sahara. It is quite certain, he thinks—and he gives weighty reasons for so thinking—that no emigration of the English people, or of those reinforced by other races, can make any such impression on any part of the African Continent as to transform regions peopled by blacks into regions peopled by whites. He proceeds:-

'To take an extreme assumption, however, we may suppose the whole emigration that now leaves Europe for America and Australia diverted suddenly to Africa, either because prospects in Africa became suddenly so attractive as to kindle the popular imagination, or because the people of America and Australia had restricted the influx of settlers by legislation. The whole excess of emigrants over immigrants from Great Britain may be put roughly at a quarter of a million; and the settlers carried from French, German, and Italian ports can hardly exceed 200,000 more. In the course of twenty years this would mean that a population of 9,000,000 had been transported to a new home, and the most favourable estimate of the natural increase of these settlers will not raise their number above 12,000,000. It must be admitted that a great settlement of this kind would involve organization and administrative capacity of a

very rare order. The colonists will not bear to be discharged by steamers at the rate of nearly 1200 a day at a single port, and left to find work and sustenance as they can. They will have to be distributed. by railways over different parts of the continent; and the work of clearing the jungle, building roads, draining swamps, and developing mines may of course find employment for any number. Meanwhile, wherever they penetrate they will bring security and employment to the black races of the interior. These are now roughly estimated for Central Africa alone at 100,000,000. If they increase only at the rate of 1 per cent. a year during the twenty years that have been assumed, the increase will be more than double the influx of whites. If they multiply as the blacks in the United States were once multiplying, they will have grown at the rate of 50,000,000, while the whites by an impossible rate of progression will only number 12,000,000. Under these circumstances, can we conceive any large part of the continent where the whites will be able to settle down, and develop an industrial civilization, such as is found in any part of America and in Australia? In all this discussion it has been assumed, for purposes of argument, that our imaginary European immigrants will be able to spread and establish themselves everywhere. No one can seriously expect this. There must be large tracts more or less like Senegambia and the parts about Sierra Leone, where only white men of exceptional constitutions, and submitting to a very strict regimen, can live and do work. In the struggle for existence the African race, which can flourish everywhere in its native habitat, is bound to have an advantage over the race that can only thrive in the best parts of the continent.

The argument which is urged by Mr. Pearson with regard to Central Africa appears to be even stronger in respect of the islands of the Malay Archipelago. 'That any great number of European immigrants could be acclimatized in them, seems more than doubtful: that even if they came they could compete with the Chinese labour, which follows the English rule everywhere in Malaysia, is not to be believed. The work of the European in this Archipelago is to organize government, maintain peace, make roads, and form plantations.' Then, as to that vast tract of country in Central Asia that offers great possibilities for settlement, the chances are, Mr. Pearson thinks, that it will be peopled chiefly from China, which possesses the better twothirds of Turkestan, and can pour in the surplus of a population of 400,000,000. The Aryan race may make some small gains in the south-east of Europe, where probably the Turk will, sooner or later, die out. Russia may contribute a large immigration to Western Turkestan. France and Italy may gradually Europeanize Algeria, Tunis, Tripoli, and even Morocco. But the small triumphs that the Aryan race may achieve in these directions are likely, Mr. Pearson judges, tobe more than balanced by the disproportionate growth of what we consider the inferior races. The history of our Straits Settlements may show how the Chinese are spreading. And there is a great presumption that they will, sooner or later, overflow their borders, occupy new territory, and submerge They are bound to rule, and probably people, weaker races. Nay, it is conceivable that they may supersede men of European descent in parts of Central and Southern America. It is also conceivable that the Hindoo race may spread over Beloochistan and Southern Persia. Brazil will pass more and more into the hands of the Negroes, who already form about half of its population, as certain of the United States are believed to be passing. Mr. Pearson's conclusion is that the parts of the earth which are most fertile, and which are, or are bound to be, most populous, are the inalienable freehold of the inferior races, though the higher races may contribute, and may be needed, in the first instance, to organize and develop them.

fa ed nyitt

8,

n 7-

18

0

ls

n

t-

se

a,

is-

(e

of

e-

be

0-

a-

Il

rk

ge

ay

en

ay

tobe

'The day will come, and perhaps is not far distant, when the European observer will look round to see the globe girdled with a continuous zone of the black and yellow races, no longer too weak for aggression, or under tutelage, but independent, or practically so. in government, monopolizing the trade of their own regions, and circumscribing the industry of the European; when Chinamen and the natives of Hindostan, the States of Central and South America, by that time predominantly Indian, and it may be African nations of the Congo and the Zambesi, under a dominant caste of foreign rulers, are represented by fleets in the European seas, invited to international conferences, and welcomed as allies in the quarrels of the civilized world. The citizens of these countries will then be taken up into the social relations of the white races, will throng the English turf, or the salons of Paris, and will be admitted to intermarriage. It is idle to say that, if all this should come to pass, our pride of place will not be humiliated. We were struggling among ourselves for supremacy in a world which we thought of as destined to belong to Aryan races and to the Christian faith: to the letters and arts and charm of social manners which we have inherited from the best times of the past. We shall wake to find ourselves elbowed and hustled, and perhaps even thrust aside, by peoples whom we looked down upon as servile, and thought of as bound always to minister to our needs.'

But if this view is well founded, if the white race is precluded by natural laws from colonizing, on a large scale, anywhere except in the temperate zone, while the inferior races increase and multiply and replenish the earth and subdue it, what will be the effect on the condition of European countries? The danger, danger, Mr. Pearson tells us, is that the expansion of the English, the Russians, and other like nations will be arrested, and the character of the peoples profoundly modified, as they have to adapt themselves to a stationary condition of society. The danger is, further, that while the lower races are raising themselves to the material level of the higher, the higher may be assimilating to the moral and mental depression of the lower.

Now one striking characteristic of the English people has been great energy and self-reliance. Nowhere has the struggle for existence been so fierce as in these islands. Nowhere has the doctrine of individualism been carried so far. But when the outlet provided by emigration receives a check, it is difficult to suppose that there will not be a great change in the direction of State socialism. England, of all countries, has benefited most by emigration, and will suffer most by the cessation of it.

'If her people appear to be losing the impulse to better themselves outside England, or are denied the opportunity, we may surely assume that these changes will be accompanied with a transformation of character. Crushed or cowed by the forces that surround him, the Englishman will invoke the aid of the State. Universal suffrage, which was inevitable, has given him the machinery for moulding all the forces of government to his purpose, and he will in all likelihood employ them to introduce an extended socialism of the Australian type. It is quite possible that these changes will be worked out slowly, temperately, and wisely. There is no reason why they should be attended with any forcible confiscations of property or cancelling of national obligations. It is conceivable that the soil of England and Scotland might be bought back from its present proprietors, as different statesmen have proposed the soil of Ireland should be, by the creation of a large Three per cent. Stock, the interest on which should be paid by a peasant proprietary. The coal-mines of England might be resumed in the same way, and worked for the State. The question is not whether these changes are desirable and would answer the ends expected, but whether they are not possible and even likely. The case assumed is, that the races of Europe have very nearly reached the extreme limit of expansion, that they will wrest nothing from the inhabitants of tropical countries, and are even likely to lose a little to them, and that when the temperate zone is fairly peopled, so that immigration on a large scale will be discouraged by every country, England, which unites a small territory to a dense population, will find itself face to face with the problem how to feed and clothe its people. If we assume a nation, so circumstanced, to become stationary, as France is tending to do, that in itself involves a very great change in character and habits of life-a change, perhaps, quite as great as

the adoption of State Socialism. If, on the other hand, we suppose, as perhaps is more probable, that the passage to a stationary condition has to be spread over several generations, in 'that case there must be some means of supporting the ever-pressing burden of fresh lives. . . . If anything like the democratic programme of the day comes to be realized; if every man, weak or strong, skilled or unskilled, is assured work on fairly equal terms; if the hours of labour are limited; if the State takes the employment of labour more and more into its own hands, buying up lands and factories and mines, the change will practically be as great as that which has transformed serfs or slaves all over the world into free labourers.'

esises

1

d

n

t

y

il

d

0

e

s

e

f

f

d

n

1,

15

r.

18

(8

13

Such a change, Mr. Pearson remarks, will reproduce many of the conditions of primitive society, and conditions that we associate with inferior races. It will aim at excluding from the community the presence of want. It will also exclude the stimulus of progress. But it does not, by any means, mean the furling of the battle-flag and the reign of universal peace. whole course in which political events have been flowing for half a century, and are still flowing, points to a different issue. There is a rooted conviction in the public mind that only powerful empires can maintain themselves in the immediate future, and that, for the purposes of self-preservation, the weak must unite, and the strong secure themselves by anticipating their neighbours. It seems, therefore, that the utility of armies. is likely to endure: that every State must have a strong military executive, more or less independent of party combinations, and more or less autocratic. Nor let it be supposed that volunteers, militia, or landwehr on a vast scale will take the place of regular soldiers. The conclusive evidence of history is that well-trained troops and professional generalship are indispensable to success in war. Universal military service seems. inevitable. Military absolutism will be combined with industrial socialism in the communities of the future. But this will, in fact, be the adoption of the old social forms which are eminently consonant to the genius of those lower races that are likely to increase in numbers and become strong-the Chinese, for example. And if China were to become a great Power, which Mr. Pearson seems to think in a high degree likely; if her flag floated on every sea, and her naval officers visited every great port as honoured guests; if her army was an important factor in the peace of the world, and her diplomatists were respected in consequence; if her commerce was world-wide; if her literature was achieving a success of esteem for style and thought, it is inconceivable that these influences should not tell upon the character and conduct of mankind.

'The resources of China are immense. The capacity of the people for toil is unlimited, and their wants are of the slenderest. The great mass of the people lives ascetically, and retains its habits, even when it is thrown among wasteful races like the English of America and Australia, who despise and distrust asceticism. The organization of labour appears to be largely in the hands of employers, who maintain their ascendency by murder. We may assume all this to be modified, but we cannot assume the change to be so sudden and complete that Chinese industry will conform to the standards of the Western world. What is true of the Chinese is true more or less of Hindoos and Negroes. A hundred years hence when these races, which are now as two to one to the higher, shall be as three to one; when they have borrowed the science of Europe, and developed their still virgin worlds, the pressure of their competition upon the white man will be irresistible. He will be driven from every neutral market and forced to confine himself within his own. Ultimately he will have to conform to the Oriental standard of existence, or-and this is the probable solution—to stint the increase of population. If he does this by methods that are inconsistent with morality, the very life-springs of the race will be tainted. If he does it by a patient self-restraint that shows itself in a limitation to late marriages. national character will be unimpaired, but material decline will have commenced. With civilization equally diffused, the most populous country must ultimately be the most powerful; and the preponderance of China over any rival-even over the United States of America—is likely to be overwhelming.

'Let us conceive the leading European nations to be stationary, while the Black and Yellow Belt, including China, Malaysia, India, 'Central Africa, and Tropical America, is all teeming with life, developed by industrial enterprise, fairly well administered by native governments, and owning the better part of the carrying trade of the world. Can any one suppose that, in such a condition of political society, the habitual temper of mind in Europe would not be profoundly changed? Depression, hopelessness, a disregard of invention and improvement would replace the sanguine confidence of races that at present are always panting for new worlds to conquer.'

One prospect, then, before the world, Mr. Pearson thinks, is that universal military service will become the rule. Another is the growth of large cities of an increasing ratio. The urban population of England is now nearly double the rural, and the tendency of people to concentrate themselves in towns is becoming more and more marked. The discoveries of physical science have, in many cases, enabled the farmer to substitute machinery for hand labour, and to employ a few well-trained and highly paid men for many ill-trained and poorly paid. Again, the attractions of town life very much overbalance those of country life for the majority; and the industrial reasons which

a

0

e

d

e

f

8,

ir

te

ıl

10

ıd

If

y

nt

8,

ve

us e-

of

fe,

ve

he

al

be of

of

is

er

an

nd

is

cal

ite

ed

id.

ose

ich

rge

urge men into the cities are enhanced by the attractions of amusements, social intercourse, economy. But cities have no tendency to create genius or individual distinction. And there is reason to believe that townsmen of many generations lose stamina and decline in stature to a degree that implies perilous degeneracy. It is already found necessary to pick the members of the London police force chiefly from men born in the country. Hitherto, indeed, the physical standard of urban populations has been kept up by the continuous immigration of the most energetic and vigorous members of the rural communities. Before long, however, the country immigrants will be an imperceptible addition to any great English or Scotch city. Then the City type will become more and more pronounced the type of the Manchester or Bellevue operative, with an inheritance of premature decrepitude, with an horizon narrowed to parochial limits, with no interests save those of the factory or the Trades Union; with the faith of the Salvation Army that finds expression in antics or buffoonery, or with that even more lamentable scepticism to which the bestial element in man is the only reality :-

'The dweller in a great city is tending more and more to become a very small part of a very vast machine. It is not only that his daily work is less varied, and makes less demands on resource and fertility of expedient than it did, but his whole horizon is narrowed. Put, on the one hand, the elevating influence of the State school, which has taken him through a primary reader series, and add, it may be, an occasional visit to the museum; and assume, on the other hand, what is becoming more and more a fact, that the artisan's daily walk from the house to the factory represents his knowledge of God's earth; that he has never wandered by the sea-side, or in the woods; knows nothing such as village children know of life in the hedges and the farmyard; never sees the dawn whiten and flush over heather, or has looked up at the stars except through an intervening veil of smoke and fog. Does any man dream that an excursion train, with its riotous mirth and luncheon-baskets, and few hours' freedom to stand on a pier or stroll through the streets of a country town, can compensate to millions of human beings for nature quite shut out? What kind of children will those be who grow up when the best sanitary laws have restricted the intercourse with animals even more than is now customary in towns; who have never picked buttercups and daisies, who read in poems of the song of birds that they cannot hear, and of a beauty in the seasons which they only know by vicissitudes of hot and cold? Will not their eyes be dimmed for all sights but those which a shop window can afford? And will not their minds be the poorer by many bright memories which their mothers had? Yet these are not even the chief losses which a city life entails. There is an inevitable companionship in country life which Vol. 177.-No. 353.

draws rich and poor together. At the cricket-ground and in the hunting-field, in church and in social gatherings from harvest-home to school-feast, squire and parson, farmer and hind, meet together animated for the hour with the same kindly thoughts. In the great majority of villages, at least, the cottager looks for sympathy in his troubles to the Rectory and the Hall. Even where the clergyman has been torpid and the landowner non-resident, the village has still been a community of neighbours interested in one another. In the multitudinous desolation of a great city contact between rich and poor is scarcely possible, and as there are no abiding homes there are no real neighbours. Strangers who will help with relief, or, it may be, close the dving eyes of the destitute, are a poor exchange for families that have lived near one another, toiled together, taken holiday together, for generations. . . . It seems impossible to question that the old family feeling, with which self-respect, loyalty to kindred, discipline and sexual purity were intimately associated, must in course of time disappear from large towns, unless some radical change should make home life possible to the toiling and thrifty part of the population.

'Now the State Socialism which is growing upon us, and the scientific teaching which we are all disposed to admit, are combining in some respects to a hopeful solution of some of these difficulties.

Nevertheless, even these reforms, which perhaps are possible and probable, would only be of partial efficacy as regards health. They would restore the sanctity of family life, but they could not bring back the old authority of family ties; and they would scarcely touch the deplorable isolation of the townsman from that world full of sweet sights and sounds, that divinity of hill and glade and running stream which were anciently the inheritance of the whole

human race.'

Again, the vast and rapid increase of national debts is a grave matter. No doubt such debts may be incurred from justifiable and good reasons. But it is customary to assume that the wealth of a prosperous country increases almost as rapidly as its indebtedness. An increase of indebtedness is, however, of its nature permanent. An increase of prosperity is not only not certain to last, but is practically certain to be reduced, now and again, by bad years.

'Six or eight years of great depression, attended with the closing of factories, the throwing of land out of tillage, and the working of half the railways at a loss, would tell very seriously upon the capacity of even a prosperous country to meet its engagements. As for the supposed guarantees of a debt, they are all more or less visionary. In a great time of depression the State must resume its customs' duties or its mines, if it has pledged them, and its lands and its railways may be unsaleable at any depreciation. . . What is to be feared is, that if national debts continue to increase on the assumption that general prosperity is bound to advance in the future as it

has done in the past, a great many communities are bound to have recourse to repudiation when bad times come, though the form of bankruptcy may be artfully disguised. A sweeping succession duty would be an insidious and very practicable form of relieving the State from unpleasant obligations. . . . When a State undertakes enterprises beyond its strength, it always does it at the risk of bankruptcy, whatever its good intentions may be. The question is, whether the tendency to State Socialism may not be a tendency also to the running up of large debts.'

The late Mr. Ticknor used to express the opinion that 'the ancient civilizations had been undermined and destroyed by two causes—the increase of standing armies and the growth of great cities; and that modern civilization had now added to these sources of decay a third, in the hypothecation of every nation's

property to other nations.'

ho

me

ner

eat

his

nas

een

Iti-

is

eal 080

hat

er.

old

ine

ime

ake

.

en-

in

ies. ble

lth.

not

cely

orld

and

pole

s a

rom

ime

as

is,

y is be

be

sing

the

As

less

its

and s to

mp-

s it

has

Mr. Pearson's argument then, so far, has been this: 'that what we now call the higher races will not only not spread over the world, but are likely to be restricted to a portion only of the countries lying in the temperate zone; that under the pressure which will be increasingly felt as outlets to trade and energy are closed, State Socialism will be resorted to as the most effective means of securing labour from want; that great armies will need to be maintained; that the population of cities will grow in number year by year; and that in proportion as the State's sphere of activity is increased will the indebtedness of the State increase also in every civilized country.' Whether this condition of things will be found good, tolerable, or bad, must depend, Mr. Pearson remarks, upon the spirit in which the community takes it. The future of society, he thinks, depends very much upon the perpetuity of national feeling. And he devotes a chapter to the proposition that the modern State does incomparably more for men and women than ancient forms, political or social, attempted. It has superseded the Church, he judges, in its hold upon popular imagination by the great benefits it assures to its members; and it is entitled in return for its services to demand a more complete surrender of selfish personal interests.

'If the world is filling up, as seems probable; if great migrations of toilers are bound to become impossible at no very distant date, the mass of men will have to regard the country they are born in as their home for life, and will be attached to it by interest as well as by sentiment. It seems not quite visionary to suppose that a day will come when service of some sort will be exacted from every man under pain of social discredit, or legal liabilities, as military service is now exacted from every able-bodied man on the Continent; when

the immigration of aliens will be restrained within reasonable limits; when wealthy men will be forced by public opinion to give money for national endowments as freely as they did in the Middle Ages, and when the doctrine that men can divest themselves of obligations to their country by leaving it will seem extravagant. In that case, the spirit of uncalculating devotion to the common cause, which even in our own days has changed the face of half Europe and rescued society from dissolution in North America, will become a steady principle of action, deserving to be accounted a faith, and lifting all who feel it into a higher life.'

This, then, is what Mr. Pearson calls 'the religion of the country,' which he considers likely to become a deeper and more serious feeling, as Christian churches more and more lose their hold upon mankind, and the belief in the supernatural, the sense of duty to God, the prospect of living forward into eternity grow dim or disappear. But how will this 'religion of the State,' as the real Providence, affect the family? Very seriously, Mr. Pearson judges. He points out that the stringency of the marriage tie, long jealously guarded throughout the civilized world as the palladium of society, has gradually become everywhere relaxed, in greater or less degree; the old indissoluble life union being transformed into a union during good conduct -very widely interpreted-or into a union during pleasure. It is a change, he urges, that cannot fail to be fraught with momentous consequences. As the thought of family duties disappears more and more from marriage, and it comes to be regarded more and more as legalised concubinage, in which legal formalities are employed only to guarantee the wife's self-respect and to assure her social position, the whole condition of home life will be changed. It is not improbable that in many cases husbands and wives, who are not very sure of themselves, will refrain from complicating their relations by having children. They will then be always ready to quit one another. And the fact that they so hold themselves in readiness will, in many cases, bring about a separation. And as the marriage tie is relaxed, so, Mr. Pearson continues, will the whole constitution of the family fall into dissolution. State systems of primary education have largely restricted the father's right, so long unquestioned, to bring up his children as he would. And it is conceivable that as parents lose their proprietary and administrative rights over children, an increasing number will be inclined to shift all responsibility upon the State. We may imagine the State crèche and the State doctor and the State school, and the child, already drilled by the State, passing from the State school into the State workshop. However this may

be,

be, certain it is that in proportion as the tie uniting husband and wife becomes more and more capricious, as the relations of the children to the parent become more and more temporary, the old sacredness of the family will fade away. It will lose its importance as a constituent part of the State, as the matrix in which character is moulded. And in like manner the old gracious and cordial relation of master and servant, of employer and employed, will disappear, and indeed has already largely disappeared. Mr. Pearson, however, thinks it possible that as husband and wife, parent and children, master and servant, family and home, lose more and more of their ancient and intense significance, the old imperfect feelings will be trans-

muted into love for the fatherland.

ts:

ey

es,

se,

ven

ned

ady

all

the

and

ose

the

nity

ite,

Mr.

the

ized

ery-

uble

duct

ure.

with

aties

o be

egal

pect

ome

cases

wilt

dren.

1 the

nany

ie is

ution

mary

long

it is

inis-

ll be

may

State

from

may be.

But what will the effect of these changes be on character? The prospect, Mr. Pearson opines, is that a sensuous, genial, fibreless society will supervene. We shall get a world that is mostly secular in tone, and the family, as it loses its influence, will cease to transmit the traditions of a consecrated household There is reason to believe that physical science has done its greatest and most suggestive work. There is nothing left for it but to fill in the details. The higher forms of literature show signs of exhaustion. It seems probable that journalism will absorb more and more of the world's intellect. The average duration of life may increase, as it becomes less worth living. But a world predominantly of old people, if of more stable political order, and of greater efficiency of exact thought, will be a world with less adventure and energy, less brightness and The world will be left without deep convictions, or enthusiasm, without the regenerating influence of the ardour for political reform; without the fervour of pious faith-which has quickened men for centuries, as nothing else has quickened them, with a passion for purifying the soul-with no purpose beyond supplying the day's needs and amusing the day's vacuity, and still with the terrible burden of personality to be borne! Society seems destined to exist—so Mr. Pearson forecasts—with all that the best ordered polity can secure it, with all inherited treasures of beauty, and with no spiritual sense to understand what surrounds it; with the mind's vision growing dim, and with no hope or suggestion of life beyond the grave. Our intellectual discipline will then be derived from the year book and the review; our intellectual pleasure from the French novel. It is more than probable—so he concludes his book—that what the Norsemen conceived as the twilight of the gods is coming on the earth; that our science, our civilization, are only bringing us nearer to the day when the lower races will predominate

in the world, and when the higher races will lose their noblest

So much may perhaps suffice to give our readers some conception of the argument put before us in Mr. Pearson's very suggestive and well-written pages,-pages which everywhere bear evidence of wide culture, and of much reflection upon the most important problems of the age. We have let Mr. Pearson speak for himself; and we have not interrupted his exposition by any comments of our own. And now, in proceeding to express our views regarding the picture which he has traced of the coming time, we would first remark that his work is greatly marred by what, for want of a better word, we may call doctrinairism. We possess no knowledge of his opinions in religion, philosophy, or politics beyond that which may be derived from his pages before us, and from his former work which we have mentioned. Judging from them, we should imagine that he has been strongly influenced by a certain advanced school of French Radicalism. This may account for his taking seriously the diatribes of that very blatant atheist, the late M. Paul Bert, against the Society of Jesus.* This, again, may supply the explanation of his placing Joan of Arc side by side in his temple of Fame with the late M. Gambetta: 'a heroic statesman,' whose heroism consisted in hurling raw levies of peasants to meet certain death at the hands of the triumphant Germans, and whose statesmanship never soared above a discreditable electioneering dodge. Surely, too, to French inspiration must be due the singular statement that 'the law making marriages dissoluble' is the 'correlative' of 'marriages of inclination.' The very essence of marriage, according to the canonists, is a perfectly free consent. Fraud, force, or fear-even the metus reverentialis entertained by a child for a stern parent—they regard as a sufficient reason for declaring it null; and that, too, although it has been consummated, and children have been born of it. The unity and indissolubility of matrimony—a state of life involving the fusion of two personalities, and fraught with momentous consequences to both, but especially to the woman, and to society -they judge to issue from the nature of things in their ethical relations. And their sufficient reply to complaints of the strictness of the nuptial bond is that people enter upon it advisedly of their own free will. Mr. Pearson appears to hold the singular doctrine that, if obligations are freely contracted,

est

n-

ery

ere

he

on

on

to

of

tly

all

in

be

ork

uld

ain

for

ist,

his,

Arc

a:†

the

red

, to

that

' of

age,

aud,

y a for

con-

nity

the

con-

heir

s of

n it hold cted.

they

they may be as freely repudiated. Once more: in the statement that 'there is a revolt of morality from the doctrine of punishments and rewards,' * we surely have an echo of the flabby sentimentalism, 'the indiscriminate mashing together of right and wrong,' as Carlyle calls it, which is the substance of the Gospel according to Jean-Jacques Rousseau. Unquestionably there is such a revolt in the popular mind. As unquestionably, that revolt is not due to morality, but to the obscuration of the primordial principles of ethics. The connexion between wrong doing and suffering, and right doing and blessedness, is of the very essence of the moral law. The categorical imperative of duty means an obligation which it is our supreme good to obey, our supreme evil to disobey. Law imports a penal sanction. 'There is something,' writes Kant, 'in the idea of our practical reason which accompanies the transgression of an ethical mandate, namely, its punishableness.' † The connexion between moral evil and punishment is not accidental but necessary. It issues from that reason which is at the heart of things. Hooker has admirably stated this truth: 'Good doth follow unto all things by observing the cause of their nature, and, on the contrary side, evil by not observing it. And is it possible that man, being not only the noblest creature in the world, but even a world in himself, his transgressing the law of his nature should draw no manner of harm after it? Yes: "tribulation and anguish unto every soul that doeth evil."' What Mr. Pearson calls morality is a mere abortion of ethics, substituting selfishness for duty, which is essentially self-sacrifice; selfishness, sublimated and idealised, it may be, but still retaining its essentially base and ferocious character. This is the result of ignoring the spiritual side of man's nature, the divine aspect of life.

What we have just written may serve to indicate one great drawback to the value of Mr. Pearson's work. His whole tone is unethical. But, as Aristotle truly teaches, man is an ethical animal, having perception of right and wrong, justice and injustice, and the like. That is the first fact about him. And any speculations on national life and character which ignore that fact must, of necessity, be gravely defective. We are far indeed from denying that there is much in the existing condition of society which supplies grounds for Mr. Pearson's gloomy forecast; that there is a lamentable amount of truth in his

^{*} P. 272.

^{† &#}x27;Kritik der prak. Vernunft,' 1st Part, Book I., § 8.

Ceclesiastical Polity, Book I., c. 9.

account of the tendencies of the age, and of the goal which is the natural and logical issue of those tendencies. Let us dwell

on this a little.

If we view the history of the progressive races of the Western world, as a whole, we may properly regard it as the history of the evolution of human personality. The two greatest factors in that evolution have been Roman jurisprudence and Christianity. At the dawn of European history neither personal freedom nor individual ownership can be said to have existed. The family, not the individual, was the social unit. The unemancipated son differed nothing from a slave. Woman was never emancipated: as daughter, or as wife, she was in perpetual tutelage. The work of the great jurisprudents of Rome was gradually to vindicate individual freedom of person and property: to shape, on rational principles, the law of private right. Christianity took up their work and carried it further than the lawyers had dreamed of. Their conception of a person was a man endowed with civil status—'homo civili statu præditus.' Very different is the Christian conception. It accounts free volition—the power of choosing a course of action without regard to the weight of motives for or against that course—the essence, the very form of personality: for such freedom is the condition of the realization of the ethical end in virtue of which personality is predicated of man. Selfconscious, self-determined, morally responsible, man alone, of all animals, is a person, and therefore alone is capable of rights and subject to duties, in the full and proper sense of the words. It was by insisting upon the moral freedom and moral accountability of men, that Christianity inspired the corrupt and moribund civilization of the Roman Empire with new life. It vindicated the spiritual liberty of man, and recreated the individual. It vindicated the spiritual equality of woman, and recreated the family. And by this vindication of the rights and duties of personality, it renewed civil society. Mr. Mill truly witnesses that the separation, upon which it insists, between temporal and spiritual authority, had 'the happiest influence upon European civilization'; for that separation 'is founded upon the idea that material force has no right over the mind, over conviction, over truth.' * The conception of man's freedom as ethical and spiritual, as resting upon the infinite worth of human personality, and its direct relation with the Divine Personality, has been the direct

 ^{&#}x27;Dissertations and Discussions,' vol. ii. p. 243.

source of all that is noblest in modern civilization.* It is a principle which has been too strong for the usurpations whether of Churches or of States, and which has issued in the gradual emancipation of the forces which make up individual life. Liberty of person, liberty of property, liberty of worship, liberty of education,—they are all the fruits of what Victor Hugo has called finely, if with too French rhetoric, the Tree of Liberty which was planted on Golgotha eighteen centuries ago: 'Le premier arbre de la liberté, c'est cette croix sur laquelle Jésus-Christ s'est offert en sacrifice pour la liberté,

l'égalité et la fraternité du genre humain.'

is ell

rn

of

is-

nal

ed. he

ras

er-

me

nd

ate

a

rili

on.

rse

nst

for

cal

elfof

of

of

and

the

relity

ion ety.

aparano

on-

rect rect

urce

Now no one with eyes to see can look around the Western world and doubt that this great doctrine of human personality is everywhere called in question and is widely discredited. Richter, at the beginning of the century, observed that the tendency of our civilization was to make men as so many drops of water for the service of a monstrous steam-engine. This is a result, both directly and indirectly, of that absorbing devotion to physical science which so specially characterises the age. Let us not be misunderstood. We yield to none in admiration of those stupendous conquests of the modern mind which have so marvellously increased man's dominion over matter and its forces, augmenting incalculably the world's wealth, amplifying indefinitely human comfort, and adumbrating an illimitable career of material progress for the generations to come—

'Of those, that eye to eye shall look
On knowledge: under whose command
Is Earth and Earth's; and in their hand
Is Nature, like an open book.'

^{*} Lotze excellently observes: 'The relation of Christianity towards the external condition of mankind was not that of a disturbing and subversive force; but it deprived evil of all justification for its permanent continuance. It did not forthwith abolish the slavery which it found existing; but in summoning all men to partake in the kingdom of God, it condemned it, nevertheless: at first it let polygamy continue, where it existed; but this must necessarily disappear spontaneously when the spirit of Christian faith made itself felt in the relations of life. And this conflict is still carried on in many directions, for the perversity of human nature, which is ever much the same, opposes to the better way all the resistance of which it is capable; but there is one permanent advantage by which the new life is distinguished from antiquity. That which was better and juster did, indeed, make for itself a way in ancient life, but almost exclusively, in those cases in which the oppressed struggled manfully with the oppressor. The provident humanity which, without seeking its own happiness, takes the part of the suffering section of mankind and requires and exercises deeds of mercy and justice, was something very foreign to the ancient world, and in the new world it has no more powerful source than Christianity.' ('Microcosmus,' Book VII., c. 5.)

Still, unquestionable it is that the minute subdivision of labour rendered necessary by the stupendous mechanical improvements of our age, has been in a high degree degrading and damnatory to a large portion of mankind.

'Oh what a world of profit and delight
Is open to the studious artisan!'

sang one of our poets in the age of handicraft. Machinery has shut off that world from most artisans, and has made of them mere machines. This result was not unforeseen by clearheaded men. A hundred years ago Adam Smith pointed out that the division of labour, by confining the industry of the masses to mechanical and sedentary operations, tended to render them incapable of any generous and noble sentiments, or of forming a judgment on the great interests of the country, and to corrupt both the courage of their minds and the activity of their bodies.* But the indirect results of our worship of physical science have been more disastrous still. What is called 'the scientific spirit'-the mode in which physicists pursue their operations being meant—is very often imported into provinces of thought where physics, as such, has nothing whatever to say, and where its methods are wholly inapplicable. Sir William Hamilton observes that 'an exclusive devotion to physical pursuits, by exhibiting merely the phenomena of matter and extension, habituates us only to the contemplation of an order where everything is determined by the laws of a blind or mechanical necessity, the effect of which is 'that the student becomes a materialist, if he speculate at all.'t Now he does speculate in these days a great deal, especially on purely metaphysical questions, and usually without any knowledge of metaphysics, or with that smattering of knowledge which is really worse than total ignorance. And the net result of his speculations is to reduce psychology to molecular physics, to make of ethics mere generalizations from experience, to deny the existence in man of conscience, free will, and moral responsibility, in any real sense; in a word, to depersonalize man. It is truly said that ideas 'are in the air.' Ambient, invisible, irresistible, they enter into our moral life and we know it not, just as our corporal organism is insensibly penetrated by the physical atmosphere. One cannot take up a newspaper or a magazine, in Europe or in America, without finding evidence how widely these doctrines have been diffused, and how largely they have

^{* &#}x27;Wealth of Nations,' Book V., c. 1, art. 2. † 'Lectures on Metaphysics,' vol. i. p. 35.

of

1-

g

15.

m

r-

ut

ne

to

s,

у,

of

is

ts

ed

ıg.

e.

0-

0-

ne:

ed

of

1-

at

ly t-

0-

ce

e-

of

al

at

ey.

ur

al

ie,

ly

ve

en

been received. Mr. John Morley exhibits one aspect of them when he solemnly tells us, in an unconsciously grotesque passage, 'The good man is a machine whose springs are adapted so to fulfil their functions as to produce beneficent results.'* 'L'homme-machine'—that is the conclusion of the whole matter for this school. Man is not 'man and master of his fate' as a person, but a mere automaton, and no more responsible than an automaton for his actions. And with the idea of human personality, the idea of the Divine Personality perishes also; so close is that connexion between the two for which philosophy, no less than theology, witnesses. 'See,' says Heine, 'all the gods are flown away, and there sits an old maid all by herself, with leaden hands and sorrowful heart—Necessity.'

And the same hostility to human personality which we meet with in popular philosophy is exhibited as markedly in popular politics. The great bulwark of man's freedom is the doctrine that human authority is limited and fiduciary; that it is subject to the eternal, indefeasible, and imprescriptible principles of ethics; that the essential rights of man as a personthe claims and prerogatives of conscience—are beyond its jurisdiction. But now on all sides there arises the claim-as Mr. Pearson's pages bear witness—that man belongs wholly to the State; that it should be the one supreme object of his love and reverence and worship. It is a revival of the tyranny of that Cæsarism which Christianity encountered and broke in pieces, the difference being that the new Cæsar is not one but many. Again is the dogma insisted on that the will of the ruler is the source and the norm of right. 'Il vous est défendu d'aller contre l'opinion dominante, is a first principle of modern Radicalism : we may take M. Gambetta's word for it. Do we venture to quote the ancient dictum, 'Thou shalt not follow a multitude to do evil'? The answer is, 'A multitude do evil! It is impossible.' 'Ce que le peuple veut est juste,' that 'heroic statesman' assures us. And should we urge that, while ready to render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, we must decline to render to him the things that are God's, the same authority curtly replies that 'All is Cæsar's.' Nor is the claim a mere exaggeration of demagogic rhetoric. Of all the liberties which are bound up with and flow from human personality, one of the most precious is the father's liberty to educate his children as his conscience dictates. It is matter of notoriety how largely this liberty has been invaded throughout the civilized world. The claim has been made, and has largely

^{*} Morley's 'Diderot,' vol. ii. p. 182.

prevailed, that the education of children is the immediate concern, not of the father, but of the State. The practical effect of this invasion of educational liberty is to substitute, in primary schools, for the religion of the Church, what Mr. Pearson calls 'the religion of the State'; a religion which, when worked out to its logical conclusions—as we may see in France—makes of God a force, of the world to come a coffin, of morality a regulation of police. But the prerogatives of the mother are as little respected as is the authority of the father. The position of spiritual equality with man has been secured by the doctrine of the unity and indissolubility of marriage, With that 'consortium omnis vitæ,' which, as the great Roman jurisconsult discerned, was the true norm of matrimony, her rights as a person are bound up. Without it, to quote the language of Dean Merivale, she would 'fall from the consideration she now holds among us. She would descend again to be the mere plaything of man, the transient companion of his leisure hour, to be held loosely as the chance gift of a capricious fortune.' * But the ideal of marriage which is set before us by contemporary Radicalism is that of the legislators of the French Revolution, who, by their law of the 20th of September, 1792, made of it a mere secular contract, terminable at the pleasure of either party. It is an ideal already realized in certain portions both of Europe and of America.

But we must go further. We do not hesitate to say that the cardinal principle on which modern Radicalism rests is absolutely inimical to human personality. We must remember that personality varies almost indefinitely. And as it varies, so do rights vary. It is not only the source but the measure of rights. We may say that the primordial right of man is to develop, to make full proof of his personality, the limitation being that he do not thereby infringe the rights of others. All men have rights. But all men have not the same rights. As persons men are equal. There is a fundamental democracy in human nature. But men are also in fact unequal. There is a fundamental inequality in human nature, and civilization tends vastly to increase and to accentuate it. The Irishman who, in reply to a demagogic orator's appeal, 'Is not one man as good as another?' cried out, 'Shure he is, and better too,' spoke wiser than he was aware of. Some are more, others are less men. And every man has the right, to the best of his ability, to accomplish his manhood, to be fully himself, and to take the due place and wield the due influence of his selfhood

^{* &#}x27;Conversion of the Northern Nations,' p. 153.

ı,

f

d

2.

n

-

e

5

S

h

ıf

IS

e)-

r

5,

of

n

11

.5

n

n,

e

0

d

in

in the social organism. To thwart the legitimate development, to restrict the legitimate influence of personality, is a wrong. And this wrong modern Radicalism commits when it insists upon the absolute equivalence of all men in the body politic. Men, as a matter of fact, are not politically of equal value. Equal they are in their common nature. Equal they should be before the law. Equal they are not in personality, and therefore they should be unequal politically. The principle embodied in the claptrap phrase, 'One man one vote,' is a false principle, violating the rights of multitudes who are morally entitled to many votes. Nor does it violate merely their political rights. Political power is only a means to an end. Equality of right is a mere barren notion unless it be translated into fact. Burke was well warranted when he said, 'The great danger of our times is setting up numbers against property.' And so Grattan, even more incisively: 'If you transfer the power in the State to those who have nothing in the country, they will afterwards transfer the property.' But the right to property issues from man's personality: for in this work-a-day world property is necessary to the exercise of personality. To infringe that right is a wrong to personality. And to such infringement Radicalism necessarily tends by the very law of its being. 'The world's wisest thinkers,' Mr. Mill observes, 'have, with one consent, regarded the democracy of numbers as the final form of the degeneracy of all governments.'* Such democracy annihilates those liberties for the sake of which government exists; it fetters, it strangles the personality from which they spring. It is essentially reactionary and retrograde, destroying the individuality which two thousand years of progressive civilization have so painfully evolved, and taking us back to the social state of the world's childhood.

We do not deny then, that, as we look around us on the existing condition of society, we find much which supplies too good reason for the picture drawn by Mr. Pearson of the possible future of the European races. We are not, indeed, prepared to assent to his view that the pressure of population is likely to be severely felt by us to so great an extent as he imagines. We think he greatly underrates the amount of land on the surface of the globe still available for European colonization, and that he has not sufficiently allowed for the unfavourable influence on human fecundity of life in great cities. Nor do we consider that the sanguine anticipations which he expresses of the future of the Chinese and Negroes are warranted by history, by

^{* &#}x27;Dissertations and Discussions,' vo'. i. p. 57.

philosophy, or by physical science. Races are no more equal than are the individuals who compose them. A forecast of the future must be based upon experience of the past. The Chinese are essentially a people of skilled artisans, congenitally devoid of those higher gifts and faculties which are the very roots of the greatness of Western nations. The arrested development of their civilization, their conquest by the barbarous tribe of the Manchus, and their inability in recent times to crush the Taeping rebellion till they were led by a European commander, do not lend much support to Mr. Pearson's forecast that they are bound to gain more and more upon the higher forms of civilization. There is good reason for believing that the Nigritians are capable of very little beyond unskilled labour: that they are naturally 'hewers of wood and drawers of water.' 'Self-government by the Negro,' remarks a very competent observer, 'means the restoration of cruel fetish rites, even involving cannibalism, as at present practised on certain festivals in Haiti, and the conversion of cultivated lands into wildernesses.' * The peril to the European peoples appears to us to come rather from within than from without. We agree with Mr. Pearson that there is a danger of our sinking to the moral and intellectual level of the Chinese; a view expressed years ago by Mr. Mill.† And the source of the danger we judge to be that retrogression from the Christian to the Pagan ideal of life, and that weakening of personality of which we have been writing. A world which respects nothing but physical facts and material force, which turns away from the supersensuous, the ideal, the divine, as a dream of its childhood, is assuredly doomed to decadence and decay. known and natural cannot suffice for man as a moral being. Without a spiritual horizon the whole value of life, which is its ethical value, fades away.

There is, however, a conservative, a preservative element in our civilization, the strength of which Mr. Pearson vastly underrates. That element is Christianity. To Mr. Pearson, if we rightly read him, the Christian religion appears 'grotesque and incredible': ‡ the last of the mythologies, now far advanced in its decline, and bound to fade away in the light of science. 'It seems reasonable,' he tells us, 'to assume that religion will gradually pass into a recognition of ethical precepts, and a

* 'Traits and Travesties,' by Laurence Oliphant, p. 202.

t P. 344

[†] See a striking passage in his book on 'Liberty,' p. 130, where he speaks of his fear that 'Europe, notwithstanding its noble antecedents and its professed Christianity, will tend to become another China.'

graceful habit of morality." Now this does not seem to us reasonable. We will explain why; and we will do so in the

fewest possible words.

ual

the

ese

oid

the

of

the

the

er.

ley

ms

the

ur : er.

ent

in-

sti-

nto

to

ree

the

sed

we

the

ich

but

the

ild-

The

ng.

is

in

ler-

we

and

ced

ice.

vill

da

s of

ssed

eful

It appears to us, then, that Mr. Pearson completely misunderstands the relative position of religion and ethics. Religion does not pass into morality. No; it is morality which passes into religion. There has always existed among men a belief, however dim or perverted, in a higher law than the law ruling in our members. The notion of an essential distinction between right and wrong, truth and falsehood, is a portion of that 'kernel of nature'-der Kern der Natur-which, as Goethe tells us, is in the heart of men. The primary organ-'the creative principle,' Cardinal Newman held-of religion is conscience, which exhibits a law, absolute and unconditioned, to be followed, and testifies of tribulation and anguish as the penalty of disobeying it. But it is not possible to think of the absolute and unconditioned authority of the moral law as proceeding from an abstraction. 'Ethics,' writes Kant, 'inevitably issues in Religion, by extending itself to the idea of an Omnipotent Moral Lawgiver, in whose will that is the end of the creation, which at the same time also can be, and ought to be, mankind's chief end.' † But further. The moral law reveals an obligation, and points to One from whose nature that obligation proceeds. And its categorical imperative, 'Thou oughtest, implies 'Thou canst.' But St. Paul testifies, 'The good that I would I do not; but the evil which I would not, that I do.' And who is not conscious, as a matter of fact, that this is his own case? The experience of St. Paul is the common experience of the sons of men. What, then, is the explanation? It is this. Conscience reveals a positive obligation, or command, to do, or abstain from doing, certain things. Reason tells us that a command which cannot be fulfilled is, in ethics, an absurdity. There is no such thing conceivable as an involuntary-voluntary moral action. And apart from freedom of volition there can be no ethics for human beings. Hence, if experience proves that we are unable, here and now, to fulfil a given command of the internal oracle, it is a certain sign that we must introduce a fresh element-power, energy, call it what you will-which element is religion. And so St. Paul again: 'I can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth me.' The antinomy of a perfect law binding an imperfect creature is solved by the higher synthesis of communion with the Divine and help from

* P. 336.

^{† &#}x27;Religion innerhalb der Grenzen der blossen Vernunft.' (Vorrede zur ersten Auflage.)

on high. What is impossible—as the Schoolmen speak—in actu diviso, becomes possible in actu composito, by that supernatural assistance which is the necessary postulate of all religion.

The special claim of Christianity is to supply this indispensable aid to the higher life in incomparably ampler measure and efficacy than any other religion. In its correspondence with the spiritual needs of human nature is the adamantine foundation upon which it is based.

> 'Unless above himself he can Erect himself, how poor a thing is man!'

It is the very office of Christianity thus to raise man above himself—the lower self of the passions and appetites. For eighteen centuries, it has fulfilled that office in the experience of millions, in every nation under heaven. It is fulfilling it, not less widely, in our own age. Surely we may reasonably believe, according to the oft-quoted dictum in 'Wilhelm Meister,' that 'this religion is a height to which the human species were fated and enabled to attain, and from which, having once attained it, they can never retrograde.' We are far from ignoring the Materialistic tendencies of our age, as will have been sufficiently evident from what we have said in an earlier portion of this article. But we do not agree with Mr. Pearson—if we rightly understand him—that we must necessarily continue to advance in the direction in which we are drifting. Things do not progress in a straight line: 'Inest in rebus

^{*} Compare the fine passage in Book IV. of 'The Excursion :'-

^{&#}x27;Alas! the endowment of immortal power Is matched unequally with custom, time, And domineering faculties of sense In all; in most, with superadded foes, Idle temptations, open vanities, Ephemeral offspring of the unblushing world; And, in the private regions of the mind. Ill-governed passions, ranklings of despite, Immoderate wishes, pining discontent,
Distress and care. What then remains?—To seek Those helps for his occasions ever near Who lacks not will to use them; vows, renewed On the first motion of a holy thought: Vigils of contemplation; praise; and prayer-A stream, which, from the fountain of the heart Issuing, however feebly, nowhere flows Without access of unexpected strength.
But, above all, the victory is most sure
For him, who, seeking faith by virtue, strives
To yield entire submission to the law Of conscience—conscience reverenced and obeyed, As God's most intimate presence in the soul, And His most perfect image in the world.'

humanis quidam circulus.' The very greatness of the evil will promote a reaction. And there is a certain principle of recovery in human nature. The reasonableness of the universe is not less certain than the supremacy of duty. And it is irrational to believe in the permanent retrogression of our race, of which that reason is the most distinctive attribute; in its eventual loss of spiritual, supersensuous, superhuman ideals; in its final degradation to a merely animal existence. Religion is an integral portion of our nature. And the teaching of the Great Master of religion, which was so potent an instrument in the evolution of human personality, will be an effectual bulwark against its effacement. You cannot settle the social question without the absolute idealism of Christianity. Give the workman food gratis, lodging gratis, teaching-call it education if you will-gratis, amusement gratis, and the social question will remain exactly where it was. The poor we have always with us. No number of Acts of Parliament, no number of Revolutions, will abolish Lazarus. Nor is there any real help for him save in the teaching which proclaims that he too, in his rags and with his sores, is a person of infinite value as the object of divine charity: the brother of Dives in the family of Him to whom we, in truth, minister in the meanest and most abject of the

We cannot then accept, as really prophetic, the vision which Mr. Pearson, rapt with future times, has set before us. But, in truth, it is not for us to forecast the things that are coming

upon the earth :-

ctes

ral

is-

ire

nce

ine

ove

For

ace

it.

bly

lm

an

ing

om

ave

lier

son

ng.

bus

anis

'Prudens futuri temporis exitum Caliginosa nocte premit Deus, Ridetque si mortalis ultra Fas trepidat: quod adest memento Componere æquus.'

Our concern is with the present; and equanimity is our true wisdom in dealing with it. The firm ineradicable conviction that we are on the side of truth is enough for us, quite independently of the ultimate issue. Even if truth should not prevail, to stand by it, to live for it, and, if need be, to die for it, is to choose the better part. But to return to Mr. Pearson's book. Instructive and suggestive as it is, in many ways, it seems to us chiefly notable as a sign of the times. That so candid, considerate, and comprehensive an intellect should take it for granted that Christianity is behind the age, that it has done its work, and can no longer be reckoned a great power in the world's order, surely may make us pause. The truth, we Vol. 177.—No. 353.

take it, is that Mr. Pearson, like so many other able men of the present day, confounds the accidents of Christianity, as it lives in the popular mind, with its substance, and attributes to its professors in general the theological views of a British Salvationist or a Neapolitan peasant. And that this is so no doubt is largely due to the inability of many defenders of the faith to use the language of science and of reason. Most necessary it is, in the present day, to bear in mind the wise counsel of Döllinger, that we must 'rigidly separate that which is permanent and essential in Christianity from whatever is accidental, transitory, and foreign': to realize that its fundamental truths belong to a domain entirely distinct from the domain of secular science; that its proper mission is to transform human personality by its revelation of the Divine Personality, to recreate mankind in the image of an ideal manhood. Mr. Pearson remarks in his earlier work: 'The medieval theory of a people framing their life in accordance with God's law, and regarding eternal truth, not cheap government or success, as the first cause of their existence, is among the grandest conceptions of history.' * This is true. True also is it that only on such a theory can the life of a people be led in accordance with the real dignity of human nature. The medieval version of that theory must indeed give way to one in accordance with our growing culture and wider knowledge. We must rise from the literal conception of Christianity to the spiritual. And our attitude to the conquests of the modern mind must be that indicated in the noble words of Milton: 'Truth, of what kind soever, is by no kind of truth gainsaid.' Physical science, critical science, historical science, mental science, no less than 'the science of the saints,' are from Him who is Deus Scientiarum: 'Of Him and through Him and to Him are all things.' We want a deeper, a broader, a more vital, a more ideal apprehension of Christianity than is common among us. want an exposition of it which will harmonize and consecrate all that is new and undeniable in the current knowledge. Thus, and thus only, can its teachers satisfy that craving after Law which has driven so many into Atheism, and that longing for a personal union with the Infinite and Eternal which is the root of Pantheism.

^{* &#}x27;History of England during the Early and Middle Ages,' vol. i. p. 180.

ART. V.—1. Proceedings and Ordinances of the Privy Council of England. Edited by Sir Harris Nicolas, K.C.M.G. 7 vols. 1834-7.

2. The Diary of Henry Machyn. Edited by John Gough Nichols. Camben Society, 1848.

3. Acts of the Privy Council of England. Edited by John Roche Dasent. 6 vols. 1890-3.

OST of our readers are no doubt acquainted with the voluminous series of publications issued by the Record Office under the direction of the Master of the Rolls since 1857, in which year the consent of the Treasury was given to 'a proposal for the publication of materials for the History of this Country from the invasion of the Romans to the Reign of Henry VIII.' The result of this somewhat ambitious undertaking has been to add to the library of the historical student a series of nearly one hundred separate works, many of them in several volumes, under the general description of 'The Chronicles and Memorials of Great Britain and Ireland during the Middle Ages,' uniform in size and binding, in which the various editors have more or less strictly followed the principle laid down by the Master of the Rolls and approved by the Treasury, that 'each chronicle and historical document should be edited in such a manner as to represent with all possible correctness the text of each writer, derived from a collation of the best MSS., and that no notes should be added, except such as were illustrative of the various readings; to which 'My Lords' added, that 'the preface to each work should contain a biographical account of the author, so far as authentic materials existed for that purpose, and an estimate of his historical credibility and value.'

As our readers are doubtless aware, this scheme for publishing historical documents in extenso did not by any means exhaust the activity of the Record Office, as under the direction of successive Deputy-Keepers of the Records, the example of the late Sir Thomas Hardy being ably followed by the present holder of the office, Mr. Maxwell Lyte, C.B., the enormous mass of documents preserved not only in the Rolls House, but in the British Museum and the Lambeth Library, is being catalogued and described by competent editors, amongst whom the names of Messrs. Gairdner and Brewer and of Mrs. Green will command the respect of all those who are interested in historical research, whilst the Archives of Venice and Simancas and even the Papal Regesta are now being systematically ransacked in the search for documents illustrating the History of Great Britain and Ireland. These valuable 'Calendars of State к 2 Papers,

he

in

.0-

ist

ly

he

he

nat

ial

nd

a

hat

its

in

his

ing

nal

of

. *

can

real

hat

our

the

our

that

ind

nce,

han

)eus

all

deal

We

rate

dge.

after

ging

the

Papers,' arranged under convenient categories, both Foreign and Domestic, have been issued in great numbers, the Spanish and Venetian Series alone, though yet unfinished, occupying nearly twenty bulky volumes, in which the somewhat scanty précis given by the earlier editors has now been replaced by fuller abstracts of each document, the more important papers being printed in full; whilst the Lord Clerk Register of Scotland and the Deputy-Keeper of the Irish Records have independently published many interesting volumes illustrative of the history of each country, and the assistance of the officers of the Ordnance Survey has been utilised in order to issue in fac-simile the Great Survey of William the Conqueror, commonly known as Domesday Book, and many Anglo-Saxon and

later manuscripts.

The Annual Reports also of the Deputy-Keepers of the Records, both of England and Ireland, published as Parliamentary Papers since 1862, contain a wealth of most interesting matter, supplemented since 1870 by the frequent Reports of the Historical Manuscripts Commission, which was established to 'tap' the great collections of documents in the possession of Corporations and private houses, such as Belvoir, Hatfield, and Dropmore, many unsuspected treasures being thus discovered, and thereby preserved and protected against the further attacks of the decay to which all neglected documents are unfortunately so subject. In admiring, however, the recent activity and enterprise of the officers who under the Master of the Rolls direct the action of the Record Office, we must not forget that the modern system of investigation and publication as applied to historical documents is but the successor of an earlier scheme of the same nature, and we must not fail to acknowledge the debt which we owe to the officers of the late State Paper Office, of which the present Record Office is the direct heir, and to the members of the Royal Commission on the Public Records of the Kingdom appointed by His Majesty in 1831, who first undertook the task of systematically examining and publishing public documents of historical interest, and to whom is due the credit of initiating many undertakings which were afterwards continued under the present system.

Amongst the labourers in this field none were more remarkable than the late Sir Harris Nicolas, K.C.M.G., to whom, under the auspices of the Record Commission, was entrusted the task of publishing the original MS. Register of the Privy Council, a task which resulted in the issue of the seven volumes which are first named at the head of this article. Even a cursory examination of these volumes will show that

ish

ing

nty

by

ers.

of

in-

of

of

in

m-

and

the

en-

the

d to

of

and

red,

icks.

tely

and

olls

that

lied

eme

debt

e, of

the

ls of

first

hing

due

ards

ark-

nom,

sted

rivy

even

ticle.

that

in

in those days more latitude was allowed to the editor than was considered advisable at a later period, and that Sir Harris Nicolas, so well known for the patient and laborious industry which enabled him to enrich English literature with treatises on many historical and antiquarian subjects, found it necessary to include in his undertaking a mass of most valuable matter explanatory of the constitution and practice of the Privy Council from the earliest times, together with a careful description of the MSS, which he embodied in his volumes. With the exception, however, of a fragment relating to the reigns of Henry V. and Henry VI. between the years 1421 and 1435, the actual Register of the Privy Council, as we now have it, does not begin until August 10, 1540, in the 32nd year of the reign of Henry VIII., and was not reached by Sir Harris until he had already published his sixth volume. No doubt this able and conscientious, though voluminous, editor looked forward with confidence to a long series which should follow his seventh volume, in which he hoped to make accessible to the general public the unique collection of MSS, preserved in the Council Office; but circumstances were unpropitious, the support of the Treasury was withdrawn, and almost as soon as he had reached the sure ground of an authentic collection of documents still remaining in the custody of the Department to which they belonged, the undertaking collapsed and the project of publishing the Records of the Privy Council was perforce abandoned. This was in 1837, and though many historians, notably Mr. Froude and in more recent years Mr. Gasquet, have with the consent of the authorities of the Council Office consulted the MS. records, it has almost been forgotten by the general public that a most valuable mine of original information still exists in Whitehall, having hitherto escaped the operation of the statute under which the ancient documents of other offices were transferred to the custody of the Master of the Rolls, the reason for this exception being no doubt that in the daily work of the Council Office constant reference is made to the earlier Registers on points of precedent and practice. Documents, however, of such respectable antiquity as those in the Council Office, however carefully safeguarded, do not improve under the stress of constant examination, and to the late Conservative Government is due the credit of deciding to insure this collection in some degree against the risk of accident by continuing for the use of historical students after the lapse of more than fifty years the undertaking initiated by Sir H. Nicolas, and thus to obviate the necessity of continual reference to the original MSS. The task of supervising the publication of the Register was entrusted by the late Lord President of the Council, the the Earl of Cranbrook, to one of the officers in a branch of the Privy Council Office, and in 1890 the first volume of the new issue appeared, followed at regular intervals by five others, the

last of which completes the reign of Mary Tudor,

It is to these six volumes that we propose principally to call our readers' attention in this article, not that the earlier volumes of Sir H. Nicolas do not contain much matter of surpassing interest, but because the pedigree, if so it may be termed, of the MSS now printed is more authentic than that attached to the bundles of documents preserved in the British Museum and other collections.

With regard to the MSS, themselves the present editor, Mr. Dasent, in the preface to his first volume, has given us the

following information :-

'The first entry of the existing Register was made on August 10, 1540, in the thirty-second year of the reign of King Henry VIII., and from that date until the present time the continuity of the Record is almost unbroken, and, though the character of the registration is not uniform throughout, time and carelessness have not in a great degree impaired the value of the interesting series of volumes preserved in the Privy Council Office. There are, nevertheless, some blanks; the Register from July 22, 1543, to May 10, 1545, has disappeared, but the succeeding volume has found its way to the British Museum and still remains there, together with an exceedingly inaccurate transcript of a portion of it comprised in the Harleian collection. The Register of the reign of Edward VI. in the Council Office series appears to be complete; but that of his sister Queen Mary is defective, inasmuch as there are but scanty records of the first six weeks of her reign. Fortunately, however, the Hatfield collection of manuscripts contains a volume in which is bound up a document which is evidently the rough draft of the Register of that period, of which, by the kind permission of Lord Salisbury, a copy has recently been made in order to supply the blank in the Council Office series. At later dates other lacunæ appear, amounting at the most to twenty-two years, some which are in Elizabeth's reign and some in that of Charles I. This latter blank, however, is no cause for wonder, if we remember that when the King left Oxford for the North all his papers were purposely burned in order that they might not fall into the hands of the Parliament. The fire at Whitehall in 1618 may not improbably have been the cause of the loss of other missing volumes. Diligent enquiry, both public and private, has at various times been made, not always without success, in the hope that unofficial collections might contain what was wanting to complete the series; but it is feared that nothing more may now be expected from such sources, and that we must be content with the Record as it now stands—a wonderfully perfect Record, if we consider all the risks which it has undergone." From the new the call clier of y be that itish

the t 10,

cord on is great presome disitish inacleian uncil ueen f the theld up a that copy uncil t the and cause r the night all in other as at

sider From

hope

com-

w be

h the

From this extract our readers will learn, and perhaps for the first time, how nearly complete is the MS. Register of the Privy Council as now preserved in the strong room of that office, whilst no doubt can reasonably be thrown on the authenticity of the one volume in the British Museum; and in his preface to Vol. IV. the editor gives satisfactory proofs in support of the authenticity of the Hatfield fragment and of a volume which was recovered by the office in 1730, having previously been in the possession of Mr. Speaker Onslow. For much interesting matter descriptive of the MSS., we must however refer our readers to the prefaces attached to each of these volumes, merely pointing out with reference to these essays that the principles laid down by the Treasury and the Master of the Rolls in 1857 have been strictly followed in this new issue, the editor being as much as possible kept out of sight, all unnecessary comments and inferences being studiously avoided. It is, however, to the subject-matter of these volumes that we propose to call our readers' attention, and it is in this connection that we have prefixed to this article the title of a work which, with many others of similar interest, we owe to the enterprise of a private association of historical enthusiasts—the Camden Society. Monotonous as may appear to some to be the daily records of funeral pageants by which Henry Machyn, merchant tailor and undertaker, seems to have earned his living in London during the reigns of Edward, Mary, and Elizabeth, and uncouth and even barbarous as is the spelling which he employs, the Diary of this tradesman, who dwelling in the heart of the City was necessarily cognisant of all the political and religious fluctuations between 1550 and 1563, contains many passages which throw light on the bald official entries contained in the Council Register of that period—the period which witnessed the fall of Somerset and the rise of Northumberland, the brief tragedy of the Lady Jane, the Marian persecutions and the Spanish marriage, the loss of Calais, the death of Mary and the accession of her sister. Throughout the pages of this Diary the writer never attempts to conceal his leaning towards the older form of religion which recovered a short ascendency under Gardiner and Pole, the record of the execution of heretics or traitors is generally made without remark, all the chief actors in the shifting drama of the time appear before us, and sooner or later comes the professional entry describing the magnificent extravagance of their obsequies. These must indeed have been good times for heralds and those who provided the paraphernalia for funeral banquets and 'month's minds; but our interest is mainly directed to the side lights which such a record

record throws on the official entries in the Council

Register.

The period covered by the last volume of Sir H. Nicolas, and the six volumes recently edited by Mr. Dasent, extends from August 1540 to November 1558, thus comprising the last years of the reign of Henry VIII., and the whole of those of Edward VI. and Queen Mary; but it must at once be admitted that, wide as is the range of subjects included in the entries, the Register is silent as to many occurrences of great domestic and political interest. Thus, though 'the Qwenes lamentable cace' is mentioned on December 13, 1541, we should scarcely have divined, were it not for the assistance of other State Papers, that allusion is here made to the trial and execution of Queen Catherine Howard. Many similar omissions, to which the present editor has drawn attention in his prefaces, are also to be regretted, but the explanation which he gives in his first volume may probably be accepted as satisfactorily accounting for much discreet silence on the part of the Clerk of the Council:-

'The first entry of the series, under date of August 10, 1540, relates that for the convenience of public business a book shall in future be kept in which the Clerk of the Council shall, after each meeting, enter such matters of business as in the opinion of the Council ought to be put on record. It will be observed that it is not stated that all subjects of deliberation were to be entered, or that the duty of selection was left to the Clerk, who could only act under instructions given by the Council. It does not appear that the Clerk was necessarily present at each meeting of the Council, and the minutes must, therefore, have been dictated to him, probably by ene of the King's Principal Secretaries, which may probably account for the infinite variety in the spelling of many of the proper names. It is obvious that a record made under such limitations must naturally observe a most disappointing silence as to many topics of absorbing interest which could not be safely set forth in a formal Register intended to be handed down to posterity through a succession of officials, and that the deliberations of a body which was practically the predecessor of the modern Cabinet of Ministers must often have been of too confidential a nature to be entrusted even to the sworn officer of the Council. This may account for some of the many occasions on which there is no record of what passed at the meeting of the Council. Thus we may search the Register in vain for any record of the proceedings in connection with the disgrace and execution of Catherine Howard, and for this and many other matters of almost equal interest we must refer to the State Papers in the Record Office and other public and private collections, in which may fortunately be found many of the letters, reports, and instructions drafted at meetings of the Council.'

Such

Such omissions, however, cannot deprive of its historical interest a record which relates to a period during which the English 'Dominion' in France was for the first time for many years extended beyond the immediate neighbourhood of Calais, when all the power of France was exerted in an ineffectual effort to retake Boulogne, and when the Admiral of France with an overpowering fleet was threatening Portsmouth and the Southern seaports, and even plundering the Isle of Wight. The Council Register of this date (1545) contains numerous entries relating to the despatch of the men, money, and materials necessary to secure Henry's new conquest against the attacks of the French, whilst the imminent danger caused by the presence in the Solent of the great hostile fleet with its numerous galleys—a form of vessel then almost unknown to our sailors-accounts for the frequent meetings of the Council held at Portsmouth, Petworth, and Cowdray. Sickness and the elements combined to assist the English High Admiral, Lord Lisle, afterwards Duke of Northumberland, and Henry's recent acquisition was for a time preserved in spite of this dangerous counter-attack; but this episode represents the high-water mark of English influence in France, and from this point the ebbing tide set strongly against us. In the next reign the extravagance and incompetence of the Protector shortly reduced the English Pale in France to Calais and its adjoining 'Marches,' as in 1549 the French retook all the outlying forts surrounding Boulogne, including that called Blackness, an entry in the Register recording somewhat euphemistically that Sir R. Cavendish was 'discharged of the office of Captain of Blackness,' much as now a naval captain who has lost one of Her Majesty's ships through negligence is 'dismissed his ship' by the judgment of a court-martial. Somerset sent large reinforcements both to Boulogne itself and to Calais, with a field army under Lord Huntingdon, the staff of which is given in detail in the Register; but the strain upon the resources of the impoverished country was too great, Boulogne was practically blockaded by sea and land, and both garrisons and field army languished and perished for want of necessary provisions. The English Commissioners, amongst whom was Paget, strove in vain to secure good terms; but in 1550 Boulogne was surrendered to the French, a comparatively trifling money payment being made to England in settlement of all outstanding claims against the French Crown. Having recovered Boulogne, the attention of the French was now constantly directed towards Calais, and the Register contains frequent allusions to difficulties arising between the commanders on each side. The condition of the inhabitants

inhabitants of the English Pale must have been deplorable; no longer could the garrison depend upon them for provisions; everything had to be imported, and, as was usual in those times, whilst the inhabitants and garrisons starved, the only persons who appeared to thrive were the contractors. It is only by reading the frequent entries as to the expenditure necessary to maintain the few square miles of wasted ground which yet remained to us in France, that we recognise how fortunate it was for this country that Philip's success at St. Quentin should have roused the French at last to make a determined attack upon Calais. All through Mary's reign her need of money had compelled her to neglect the repair of the fortifications; in vain had her captains represented the dangerous proximity of overwhelming forces; Lord Grey de Wilton, the Captain of Guisnes, who was an experienced soldier, entreated her to supply him with the necessary reinforcements; his warnings and entreaties were alike unheeded, and almost while the Council was engaged in a trivial wrangle with the Corporation of Calais as to the election of their Mayor the blow fell and the last trace of English domination in France was swept away.

At one cause of this catastrophe we have already hinted. The Register abounds in entries relating to the issue of warrants for so much money for Calais, but sometimes it appeared that these warrants could not be executed, the Treasury being practically empty, and more frequently still the money, though paid out, was misappropriated or misapplied. This was an age of universal peculation, and the announcement in the Register that a certain officer has received the appointment of Treasurer of, say, Berwick, is pretty sure to be followed sooner or later by an entry referring to his dismissal for peculation. This we see to have been the case in Ireland, at Calais and at Berwick, whilst even the officers of the Mint in the Tower failed to account satisfactorily for the mass of bullion which they received. It was hoped by a rigid system of audit to prevent these scandals, but the audit was so long delayed, and so many questions were raised to confuse the issue, that little was gained by this system, except perhaps by the auditors themselves, as we read in Mr. Nichols's notes to Machyn's Diary that the auditor of the Augmentation Court founded no less than nine families of his own name in Essex. Nor may we permit ourselves to suppose that these fraudulent officials were men of no position. The humbler classes, no doubt, did their best to follow in the steps of their superiors; but the Knight Marshal of Calais, Sir

Anthony Aucher, appears to have been convicted of fraud both

with

with respect to contracts for provisions to be sent across the Channel, and also for public works in Kent, whilst grave irregularities were discovered in the accounts of Sir Anthony St. Leger, the Lord Deputy of Ireland. These little peccadilloes, however, seem to have been looked upon with considerable leniency, notwithstanding the formal entries in the Register, and the usual course seems to have been for the culprit to offer the Crown a sum down in discharge of all outstanding claims, -an offer which, as the Treasury was generally empty, was seldom declined. There are, however, one or two notable exceptions to the prevailing dishonesty. Three members of a family named Gonson or Gonston, one of whom first appears at the close of the reign of Henry VIII. as 'Clerk of the Ships,' seem to have discharged in turn the duties of Treasurer of the Navy throughout the two succeeding reigns without incurring any suspicion, together with Edward Basshe, the Surveyor of Victuals for the Navy. These officers, however, who may possibly have owed their security to their technical knowledge, saw many changes in their time. Henry left a Fleet in fair condition. It was not strong enough, it is true, to beat off the Admiral of France, but it was able to prevent his doing any serious damage, and the great loss which our Fleet sustained in the sinking of the 'Mary Rose' was more or less of an accident. In the next reign the Protector's brother, Lord Seymour, became Lord High Admiral, and for his own purposes took care that the Fleet should not be neglected, but after his well-deserved execution the condition of the Navy was allowed to decay: entries appear relating to the sale of the King's ships, and to the laying up of the recently introduced galleys, whilst constant mention is made of the debts of the Admiralty and of the deficient supply of cables and hawsers, which could then only be procured from the Baltic ports, though an attempt was made by the Protector to encourage the manufacture of sailcloth in England by introducing Bretons to show our people how to make 'poldavies and olorons.'

r

f

e

f

,

e

r

n

t

g

T

r

y

0

st

t [t

s,

e

1,

n

e

is

se

e

30

ir

th th Throughout the whole of this distracted reign the exertions of Gonson and Basshe seem to have kept the Navy alive, and it is evident from the entries in the Register that on her brother's death Mary's chief support was derived from the men-of-war at Harwich and other ports on the East Coast. From this date, however, the deterioration was very rapid: the French seem to have been allowed to sweep the Narrow Seas, and to have captured the Italian Ambassadors on their way to England; and whilst the seamen in the Thames complained that the Queen had money for the priests but none for them, and even seem to have plundered

plundered foreign traders in their distress, it was with the greatest difficulty that convoy could be provided to escort the Emperor down the Channel, or a squadron collected to bring the reluctant King back to the arms of his anxious wife; and when by great exertions and many shifts the crews were at last collected with the help of the press-gang, the uncompromising Basshe informed Lord Howard that he had only a fortnight's victuals in store. So serious, indeed, was the state of the Navy at one time that the Lords of the Council seem to have been unable to place any reliance on the official reports, and the Lord Admiral was instructed to take a sudden and secret muster of the crews and ships, without any previous warning to his subordinates, and stringent orders were given that powder was not to be wasted in salutes of 'vain shot,' and that the utmost husbandry was to be used with regard to all stores. A modern First Lord, however, who has always the fear of the House of Commons and the Chancellor of the Exchequer before him, must turn an envious eye on Mary's Lord Treasurer, who undertook, provided that all present wants were made good, to 'run' the Royal Navy for an annual charge of ten thousand pounds.

But low as had sunk the Royal Navy, the germs of the maritime ascendency which was to distinguish the next reign were already in existence. Names which were soon to be glorious appear in the entries in the Register; Hawkins of Plymouth and William Winter are already in the Royal service, and perhaps under a kaleidoscopic variety of spelling we may recognise Richard Grenville in an officer at Scilly, whilst a Raleigh, a Carey, and a Yeo as 'Gentlemen Adventurers' occasionally anticipated a declaration of war and provided the Admiralty Courts with plentiful opportunities of exhibiting the law's delays. In fact, during this period, as indeed even later, the distinction between piracy and privateering seems to have been but slight. The stronger ship seems to have plundered the weaker indifferently in peace or war, the long-drawn procedure of the Admiralty Courts inviting merchants to rely for their safety more upon their armament than upon maritime law; whilst at one time it was notorious that the Lord Admiral of the period, Lord Seymour of Sudley, at least countenanced the misdeeds of the pirates, and for his own ambitious ends even allowed them to establish their own harbours of refuge at Scilly and elsewhere. It was in Mary's reign, however, that these hitherto independent freebooters ventured to combine their predatory instincts with political disaffection, and to endeavour, with French assistance, to give trouble to the government of England. But annoying as they were at sea they were impotent impotent on shore, and an attempted rising in the West and an actual landing at Scarborough merely resulted alike in the execution of the conspirators. These attempts are most briefly mentioned in the Register, and were it not for the assistance of such works as Machyn's Diary, we should often be at a loss to understand the allusions; and indeed the formidable insurrection in the West so cruelly put down by Lord Russell and Lord Grey de Wilton in the previous reign, and also Ket's rising and camp at Mousehold Heath, which proved so disastrous to Northampton's reputation as a soldier, are but incidentally alluded to in connection with the movement of prisoners and the custody of their goods, whilst Wyatt's march on London and the execution of the Lady Jane are not explicitly mentioned at all.

One great State trial is, however, given in considerable detail, viz. that which resulted in the execution of the Protector's brother, Lord Seymour, the articles of impeachment being set forth at full length in the Register; but when the Duke of Somerset's own turn to mount the scaffold arrived, a brief reference to the 'late Duke' on the day succeeding his execution is the first mention of Northumberland's completed victory

over his rival.

1

1

-

e

e

e

d

y

d

-

S

0

-

e

Throughout the reign of Edward VI. it is not too much to say that the key-note which pervades the entries in the Register is rapacity. No doubt the courtiers who surrounded Henry VIII. towards the close of his reign had made the most of their opportunities, and the ruin of the Church Establishments had laid the foundation of many great estates which have lasted until the present time; but much land still remained in the hands of the Crown. The first attack upon this reserve of resources was supported by the convenient memory of Paget, who was able to reproduce the contents of a document which he said had received the approval of the dying King, though the paper itself had mysteriously disappeared. This effort of Paget's memory is faithfully set down in the Register in order to justify the action of the King's executors in taking possession of the titles and corresponding estates which he was supposed to have intended to bestow upon them. From that moment the process of impoverishing the Crown continued. Possibly the large fish were already fairly gorged, as their names do not often appear, though Lord Russell is mentioned as securing Covent Garden and Long Acre; but the smaller fry now had their turn, and Yeomen of the Kitchen and Sergeants of the Buttery, with all the other menial dependants of the Court, jostle one another in the scramble to secure grants of the Chantry lands recently given by Parliament to the Crown. Possibly many of these entries may only refer to men of straw who lent their names or acted as trustees in order to conceal more exalted plunderers who feared to become too prominent; but however this may have been, the result was the same, and the Crown was permanently impoverished, as even a great revolution, such as that which displaced Somerset for Northumberland, merely meant that the estates of the proscribed were transferred to their triumphant rivals. How rapidly the old ecclesiastical edifices were being destroyed may be gathered from the repeated entries referring to the King's lead and bell-metal, and the record of the amount of plate broken up and sent into the Mints to be coined must bring tears to the eyes of the modern collector, who can almost count upon his fingers the number of authentic pieces of plate of this period now in existence. A small proportion of Church plate no doubt escaped, 'embeaseled 'according to the Registers of Edward VI., concealed and reproduced by devout persons according to the records of the succeeding reign, but much was no doubt stolen, and in Mary's reign a fruitless attempt was made to compel the officers of the Mint to account satisfactorily for all that had passed through their hands, whilst Lord North, the late Chancellor of the Court of Augmentations, was accused of having misappropriated much of the lead which it was his duty to dispose of for the benefit of the Crown, and even Lord Williams of Thame, who was one of Mary's earliest and most strenuous supporters, to whom had fallen the duty of superintending the execution of Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer at Oxford, was proved to owe the Crown a very large sum which he had amassed whilst he held the office of Treasurer of the Augmentations. It had been this Court which in the two preceding reigns had taken charge of the confiscated Church lands and revenues, and it was by leases and sales effected through this Court that so much of this easily acquired property of the Crown had been improvidently dispersed, and the innumerable entries in the Register referring to such grants prove that the officers of this Court, at least, held no sinecures, and also that the Court fees must have been a very considerable source of income, either to the Crown or to the officers themselves. With Mary's accession, however, all this was changed, and the operations of the Court seem to have ceased altogether, one of her earliest steps being to call upon Sir Richard Sackville and Lord North, who had in succession held the office of Chancellor of the Augmentations, to produce their books, in order that the small unappropriated remnants of ecclesiastical property might be restored to the Church. Church. All attempts, however, to induce the present holders to relinquish their grants were in vain; and after much negociation, the terms of the formal reconciliation with Rome were

such as to confirm them in their possessions.

1

e

0

0

e

e

n

e

f

-

r

it

e

n

г,

0

11

0

d

h.

The entries in the Register throw considerable light upon the ordinary financial procedure of the time. At each meeting of the Council part of the regular business seems to have been to consider the demands for means to carry on the executive government of the country. Of these claims, such as were not pressing were deferred to a more convenient season; but when payment could no longer be postponed, warrants were addressed to the officers of the various Treasuries-those of the Exchequer, the Mint, the Court of Wards, the Court of First Fruits and Tenths, the Chamber and the Augmentations-for the sums required, respect being no doubt had to the balances then in the hands of the respective Treasurers. Often, however, we see that these balances must have been somewhat too favourably computed, as the warrants remained long unsatisfied, and the creditors of the Government had consequently to wait for their money, whilst the provision of victuals for the garrisons and the repairs of ships and fortifications were perforce neglected. The improvidence of the preceding reign and Mary's religious prejudices having deprived her Government of one great source of revenue, warrants could no longer be addressed to the Treasurer of the Augmentations, and the necessities of the situation entailed a constant use of the services of a very important personage, the Queen's Agent in Flanders, Thomas Gresham, who, indeed, can have enjoyed but little leisure for many years; numerous entries relating to his bargains with the Flemish Jews, who then, as now, took care to have good security, demanded and received extravagant interest, and made many of their advances, not in money, but in goods, which probably when sold failed to realize the value put upon them. All such transactions, however, can have but one end,—the money must be paid sooner or later, and at the close of her reign Mary was driven to raise a revenue by a Forced Loan. Machyn records that in March 1557-8, the Lord Mayor and Aldermen were summoned to the Guildhall to meet the Royal Commissioners, Lord Winchester, Lord Paget, and the Bishop of Ely, to arrange the contribution of the City towards this Loan. and that three days afterwards the City Companies were able to announce what each 'Craft' would pay. In every county Commissioners for the Loan were appointed, and for many days the Register contains little but entries on this subject, showing that the money was collected with difficulty, and that those who

declined to lend the sum at which they were assessed were bound in recognisances by the Commissioners to appear before the Council to answer for their refusal, and that no excuse, except absolute inability to pay, was accepted. This general system of exaction seems to have succeeded an earlier, and probably a less successful, method mentioned in the Register, by which Privy Seals were sent direct from the Council to the prominent men in each county, calling upon them to lend the Queen 1001. Many, however, neglected to respond to this appeal, and in many cases it was no doubt the case that through collusion the Privy Seals never reached those to whom they were addressed. The Commissioners for the Loan, however, appear to have been more successful, and we note that most of those who appeared before the Council 'consented to lend' the sum required, the result being that the Government was even able to repay some of the money which had been advanced in obedience to the earlier Privy Seals.

The relations between the Government, however, and the trading community were not confined to the extortion of contributions, and it is indeed surprising that any trade should have flourished under all the restrictions imposed by the Council, which at various times interfered to fix the price of all articles of consumption. Licences had to be obtained, and not, we may be sure, without payment, to move and export grain, cattle, beer, leather, wool, and even old shoes; and the amount of each cargo, and the period during which the licence held good, was categorically specified. These documents in themselves became a species of valuable property, and though often granted to persons of distinction were sold at once to traders. The Crown itself was also a merchant in a large way: the King's lead, wool, bell-metal, and fustians had to be sold at as good a price as possible, and the Agent at Antwerp, amongst his many duties, had to see that this was secured before other traders had access to foreign markets; and when the Baltic merchants had arranged with the rope-spinners of Dantzig to take all their output for the year, they were forbidden to take advantage of their bargain until the wants of the Navy had been supplied by the Agent of the Admiralty. The export of coin was strictly forbidden, and on this subject the following passage may be quoted from the preface to the third volume of the present series :-

'As a commentary on the general question of prohibiting the exportation of coin and the consequent difficulties of merchants may be cited a Memorial addressed [in 1551] to the French ambassador, in which it is represented that the Bordeaux trade with England is

likely to cease because the French merchants will only sell their wines for ready money, which the English merchants are forbidden by our laws to offer them, to the great advantage of the Flemings, who were under no such restriction. The Council therefore suggests that recourse should be had to the primitive commercial expedient of barter, and that the regulations of the French merchants may be overruled. This is only one of many instances which show the difficulties under which trade was carried on in the sixteenth century, the result being to throw the bulk of the commercial business of the country into the hands of powerful corporations, such as the Merchant Adventurers and the Hanseatic Merchants of the Steelyard, which were better able to cope with the obstacles thrown in their way than individual merchants.

The Government, no doubt, encouraged these great Corporations for excellent reasons of its own, for they could always be depended upon to assist the Crown by a loan or by payment of 'permission money' to secure their privileges, even the poor and struggling 'Staple' of Calais at one time making a With the Steelyard the Council considerable contribution. was in constant negociation in the vain attempt to reconcile the privileges claimed by it with the undoubted rights of the Corporation of London, and questions as to the measurement and packing of cloth and the amount of dyed cloth to be included in each cargo constantly came up for decision. In Edward's reign, however, the Council decided, after hearing the arguments of the Ambassadors of the interested States, that the exclusive privileges of the Steelyard ought to be abolished, and it appears that it was proposed that a 'Diet' of the Hanseatic merchants should meet in London to consider the questions at issue. From entries, however, in the Register of the succeeding reign it appears as if this Diet had never sat, possibly because the Steelyard preferred to keep the questions open, and Mary's guarded reply to another Hanseatic embassy seems to show that the exclusive privileges were still withdrawn. In this reign deference to Peninsular prejudices must have sadly hampered a rising branch of English trade which was afterwards to be somewhat notorious, as instructions are given by the Council to stop all the ships trading to Guinea, Bonny and Elmina, thus perhaps deferring Hawkins' adventure for a few years; but in this reign too a sort of Treaty of Commerce was concluded with Sweden, apparently renewing an existing treaty which is given at considerable length in the Register of Edward VI.

e

d

e

d

rt

e

e

n

h

:

at

er

ic

to

(e

ud

of

ng

of

he

ay

or,

ely

The relations between England and her northern neighbour give rise to many entries in the Register, and we early note the Vol. 177,—No. 353.

L anxiety

anxiety which the close connection of Scotland with France was regarded by English statesmen, 'Scotland being now made French' (1551). The Protector's cruel and useless invasion of Scotland in 1547, and the battle of Pinkie Cleugh or Musselburgh, are but incidentally mentioned in the Register, principally in connection with the arrangements made for the government of England in Somerset's absence; but allusion is often made to payment of pensions to the 'English party' in Scotland, and to the necessity of maintaining those posts occupied by the English beyond the Border which must have added so much to the hatred with which this nation was then regarded by the Scots. Indeed the Register shows us that the Borders were in a state of chronic war, and we find many allusions to the difficulties which beset the Wardens of the Marches on each side, with curious references to the 'Ancient Law of the Borders,' according to which disputes were decided and criminals condemned at regular 'Days of March' after conference between the Wardens. The question of the so-called Debatable Ground was left unsettled for years, partly because it was the interest of France to keep the sore open, partly because each country tried to get the better of the other in the partition, and partly, no doubt, because it suited the turbulent and untrustworthy population to maintain a sort of 'no man's land,' from which they could escape after each outrage to one country or the other, and thus laugh at the laws of either. The chief amongst these constant offenders were the Grahams or Gremes, of whom the Netherby family is now the head, and their names are frequently mentioned in most uncomplimentary terms in the Register; but it must be admitted that the same records show that the conduct also of the Warden of the Western Marches, Lord Dacre of Gilsland, left much to be desired, and that his followers were not far behind the Grahams in evil doing, whilst we see from the records of the three reigns that the inhabitants of Tynedale, under the leadership of the Herons of Chipchase, were anything but satisfactory subjects of the English Crown, and that the mutual jealousy and constant bickerings of the northern peers must often have been an obstacle to the necessary co-operation of the English Wardens of the Marches.

During the period covered by these volumes Sir Anthony St. Leger was no less than three times Lord Deputy of Ireland, having been in the first instance sent by Henry VIII. to succeed Lord Leonard Grey, whose erratic mismanagement of that kingdom, which can only be attributed to absolute madness, led to his sudden recall and subsequent execution. Though there

there are many entries, chiefly financial, relating to Ireland, we learn but little from the Register as to its condition. The attempt to civilize the Irish chieftains by raising them to the peerage is tried with but indifferent success. Irish 'Kerne or Gallowglasses' join the motley bands of Spanish, German, Italian, and Croatian mercenaries who in Edward's reign harried friend and foe indifferently on the Scottish Borders or defended the English Pale in France; the southern harbours of Ireland were favourite haunts of English pirates; peculation seems to have been, if possible, more rampant in Ireland than in England, the Lord Deputy himself not being free from suspicion. The captains of the English garrisons employed their men as private servants, in the north the 'Redshank Scots' were already a power to be reckoned with; and whilst the Fitzwilliams already seem to have some influence in the West, the plantation of Leix and Offally, 'being the countries late O'Connor's and O'More's,' in 1550, and the anxiety to secure the allegiance of the heir of Lord Kildare, 'Young Garret' or Fitzgerald, who was with his mother's assistance induced to return from Italy and to become a pensioner of the English Court, show that our hold on the province of Leinster was not secure.

n

e

n

e h

e

d

d d

se

ly

1e

nt 's

ne

he

or

nd

ne

he

be

he

the

the

but

ual

of

ony

nd.

eed

ess,

ugh here Well wooded as Ireland was then, it was worth while to grant John Parker, the Irish Master of the Rolls, a licence to export framed timber from Liverpool to be set up as windmills, and so slight was our control over the north that a private company was empowered by Charter to take such measures to secure its rights in the fishing of the Bann as would now be allowed in the case of a Chartered Company in the interior of Africa, the adventurers being also assisted to defend themselves against the Antrim Scots, described as being there 'without the leave and privity of their Majesties,' with the loan of Government artillery.

It would be useless to attempt to enumerate within such limits as are now permitted to us all the points of interest which appear in the entries in the Register. From the interference of the Council nothing was sacred. The decay of agriculture, matrimonial differences and disappointments, disputes as to the ownership of lands, the election of aldermen, mayors and members of Parliament, in fact all aspects of private, domestic, and municipal life, are the subjects at one time or another of the deliberations of the Council, which enforced its decisions by summarily committing to prison, or by binding in recognisances for future good behaviour all those who did not render a willing obedience.

L 2

The amusements of the people naturally do not give rise to many entries in the official Register, except, perhaps, with reference to the licensing or prohibition of 'stage plays' in times of excitement, or when the nocturnal exploits of the Earl of Surrey in 1543 compelled the Council to send him to the Fleet prison, having confessed himself to be guilty of 'a lewd and unseemly manner of walking in the night about the streets, and breaking with stonebows of certain windows,' the rank of the offender no doubt removing him from the jurisdiction of the ordinary civic authorities. We find in Machyn, however, many allusions to amusements and junketings, both public and private, which show how even in times of great distress and uncertainty the citizens of London enjoyed themselves, the descriptions of the elaborate fooling of the 'Lords of Misrule' being especially noticeable on the occasion of the formal visit of the King's Lord of Misrule, George Ferrers, to the City at Christmas, 1552, when he was received in state by the Sheriffs' Lord of Misrule and conducted in procession through the streets of the City, the diary of the London tradesman supplying in this instance, as in many others, the light and shade necessary to complete the picture of contemporary social life which is given

in bare outline in the Register.

We have purposely left to the last the consideration of the indications given in the Register of the momentous and startling religious changes which occurred during the period covered by these volumes,—that is, from August 1540 to November 1558. In those short eighteen years we see almost every variety of religious feeling pervading the entries in the official record. At the close of Henry's reign his authority as Head of the Church was practically admitted; and though with the aid of the Statute of Six Articles some few offenders against the doctrine of Transubstantiation, notably Anne Ascue, were sacrificed to the reactionary zeal of Gardiner and Bonner, the Register which records these proceedings relates also the measures taken for the suppression of Melancthon's letter to Henry and the Proclamation that every church not already so furnished should 'provide them a Bible of the largest volume' before Hallowmas (1541), this Proclamation being characteristically issued at the instance of a printer who found himself unable to dispose of his large stock. Other printers were not so fortunate, and were summoned before the Council for having printed or introduced from abroad books advocating erroneous opinions, including one which is described as a 'Postilla upon the Gospelles and Pistells.' Meanwhile such important personages as Lord Cobham and Lord Clinton are called upon to answer for the offence of openly eating meat in Lent, superstitious images are to be removed (especially the shrines in the Province of York 'with their hovels'), Lord Thomas Howard and Lord Ferrers' son are warned not to be indiscreet in discussing religious matters with the young gentlemen about the Court, and the Dean of Exeter received a severe lesson as to his 'lewd and seditious preaching.' On May 5, 1543, 'the Book of Religion was read in the Council Chamber before the Nobility of the Realm;' any attempt to dispute the King's supremacy in spiritual matters was severely punished, a late monk of the Charterhouse, 'seeming nevertheless to be distract of his wit,' being sent to the Tower for this offence; and the Chapter of St. Paul's are sternly bidden to make no more delay in the election of Dr. May, the King's Chaplain, who had been

nominated by the Crown as Dean.

1

e

١,

f

e

d

1-

)-

g

ie

s,

of

ne

is

to

en

he

nd

od

0-

ry

ial

ad

the

nst

ere

the

the

to

50

ne'

rac-

self

not

ing

ous

tilla

tant

pon

to

With Edward's accession and Somerset's Protectorate the balance of power which Henry had with difficulty preserved between the opposing forces of reformers and reactionaries was at once upset. After some vacillation, possibly in consequence of the unauthorised action of the churchwardens of a London church which is described in detail in the Register, it was decided that all crucifixes and roodlofts throughout the country were to be replaced by the royal arms, and this innovation resulted ultimately in the destruction of nearly all the stained-glass and other artistic treasures yet remaining in England, thus bringing practically before the eyes of the congregations the great contrast between the ornamental and sensuous accessories of the old form of religion and the meagre ceremonial which now replaced it. These changes involved the deprivation and imprisonment of Gardiner, and opportunity was taken of a quarrel between the common lawyers and the Court of Chancery to get rid of Lord Southampton, the Chancellor, who was strongly opposed to the reforming faction, the proceedings with regard to both these cases being given at considerable length in the Register. One person however stoutly and successfully defied the reforming zeal of the Council, all attempts to compel Mary to submit to her brother's authority in matters of religion having failed, supported as she was in her firmness by encouragement from Spain. This story has been admirably summarised from the Register by Mr. Froude.

With Mary's accession, however, a rapid change in our sympathies takes place. Although the Register formally states that on August 13, 1553, the Queen solemnly announced that 'she meaneth graciously not to compel or restrain other men's

consciences

consciences otherwise than God shall put in their hearts a persuasion of the truth that she is in, by opening of His Word unto them by godly, virtuous, and learned preachers,' it soon became apparent that other and stronger arguments were to be freely used, and that those convicted of heresy by the newlyorganized Ecclesiastical Courts must pay the penalty with their lives. The Register of the earlier months of the reign contains many entries relating to the examination and trial of Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, Hooper, and Coverdale, but it was not until after the Spanish marriage and after the return of Cardinal Pole to England that the sentences on four of these prelates were carried into effect. Through the good offices of the King of Denmark, Miles Coverdale was allowed to escape, but in February, 1554-5, the fires in Smithfield were first kindled in this reign for the martyrdom of a heretic. Other sufferers for conscience sake were well remembered, Anne Ascue in Henry's reign, and Joan Bocher in that of Edward, but the London populace, too well accustomed to the execution of political offenders, was now to have frequent opportunity of admiring the constancy of those who suffered for religion's sake, and, as the feeling of curiosity gave way to one of sympathy, of encouraging them at the stake. The entries in the Register generally state that the condemned heretics are to be delivered to the bishop or to 'the ordinary,' in order that they may be converted or executed in default of conversion, but some entries explicitly mention the execution, and state that the principal men of the county were required to be present, or convey the thanks of the Council for attendance at such scenes. These entries are sufficiently numerous in the Register, but in Machyn's Diary their frequency is appalling; and we can well understand that the temper of the people, who had previously been well affected towards the Queen in spite of the hated Spanish marriage, and had certainly welcomed the substitution of the older ceremonies for the less attractive ritual of the preceding reign, now began to change, as is shown by entries in the Register relating to outrages on monks and by an order which forbade the presence at executions of apprentices or others likely to comfort and applaud the sufferers; Machyn relating that 20,000 people were present on one occasion at Stratford, when no less than thirteen prisoners were burned at once, having been sent thither through the streets of London from Newgate. These atrocities continued under the auspices of Pole and Bonner up to the close of Mary's reign, even recantation offering no means of escape, and the universal joy which was felt when she was succeeded by her sister is shown by Machyn's description of Elizabeth's progress by water from the Tower to Somerset Somerset House, where she was received with trumpets playing, and melody and joy and comfort to all true Englishmen and

women, and to all people.'

er-

on be

y-

eir

ns er,

til

ole ere

of

in

in

for

y's

pu-

ers,

ncy iri-

the

on-

rdi-

ault

ion,

nce

ng;

who e of the

tual

by an cices hyn at dat

Pole tion felt

yn's

er to

erset

In the foregoing pages we have endeavoured to lay before our readers some samples of the materials for English history contained in the Register of the Privy Council, but it must not be supposed that we have to any considerable degree exhausted the interesting contents of this mine of information which is now being made accessible to the general public through the enterprise of the officers of the Council Office. May we not hope that this example may be followed by other public departments, and that each office may be induced to retrieve its own documents from the custody of the Record Office, so that they may be made available for the historical student instead of lying —as is, we believe, the case in some instances—neglected and unsorted in dusty sacks in a purlieu off Chancery Lane? A history of each great department of the Executive Government of England might no doubt thus be compiled, and possibly then Her Majesty's Stationery Office may be led, for very shame, to make some slight improvement in the appearance of the publications, and may at length recognize that it is not absolutely necessary on economical grounds to bind up volumes without flyleaves in hideous covers, nor to print them on paper of which no two consecutive sheets are of the same quality or colour. The annual man and millionly of Lexice appropriate for institution of the contract of

to the six and the first tradition of the same and the sum of the same of the

which the Nomes states to enignating as the deportment of

Postery at least today his stand. In about these more clause in

contribute strangers for another han by the contribute of the cont

after our better the Posts of the countries and the state of the State

they would not received and an agent of the day of both of they warm

have a readily open and a real property and for all most

ART. VI.—1. The Satires of A. Persius Flaccus, with a Translation and Commentary. By Professor Conington. Oxford, 1872.

 D. Junii Juvenalis Satiræ, with a literal English Prose Translation and Notes. By J. D. Lewis. London, 1873.

 Thirteen Satires of Juvenal, with a Commentary. By Professor Mayor. London, 1886.

 Satires of Juvenal. By Messrs. Pearson and Strong. Oxford, 1887.

5. Satires of Juvenal. By E. G. Hardy, M.A. London, 1891.

 L'Opposition sous les Césars. Par Gaston Boissier. Paris, 1875.

 La Religion Romaine d'Auguste aux Antonins. Par Gaston Boissier. Paris, 1878.

 Les Moralistes sous l'Empire Romain. Par Constant Martha. Paris, 1886.

 Les Poëtes Latins de la Décadence. Par D. Nisard. Paris, 1888.

 Thirteen Satires of Juvenal translated into English. By Alexander Leeper, LL.D. London, 1892.

THERE was a moment when the primitive simplicity and austerity of Roman life began to undergo a softening process, and to become polished by contact with Greece. This was the moment seized by Lucilius for the creation of what was in effect a new form of Art. For though saturæ were written by Ennius and others, Lucilius really originated this form of composition, so interesting because it is the narrow pedestal on which the Roman claim to originality, in the department of Poetry at least, takes its stand. In Prose Rome may claim to have been the first to have raised familiar correspondence to a branch of literature in which she is still unrivalled; and she has certainly stamped her mark on history, and made jurisprudence altogether her own. In Poetry she can claim nothing save Satire, but the boast of Quintilian, 'Satira tota nostra est,' is as just as are most of the utterances of that eminent critic. When Horace adverts to the affinity of Satire to the Old Comedy of Greece, he makes an instructive literary comment; but it would be a mistake to refer the origin of Latin Satire to any such source. A still greater error would it be to connect it in any way with the Greek Satyric drama. Such a theory has been put forward, but one has only to read the 'Cyclops' of Euripidesto see that to the Latin Satira and the Greek Satyric drama there is nothing common but a fortuitous resemblance in sound between the names of two very different things. As the Greek drama. drama, which is the mightiest product of the human spirit, took its rise from the primitive worship of Dionysus, so the only form of Art which the Latin mind struck out for itself had its birth in what was essentially an act of worship, the thanksgivings and rejoicings for the harvest-home, in the course of which the peasants of agricultural Italy bantered each other in rude Fescennine strains. The first glimpse which we get of a nascent comedy in Italy is in those charming passages in which Virgil and Horace tell us of rustic merrymakings at harvests and vintage festivals, in which not only rude dances found a place, but a kind of rough exchange of scurrilities between rustics with masks of bark rudely improvised for the occasion. This was called 'the Fescennine privilege,' and its license had soon to be checked by the code of the Twelve Tables. To the Fescennine masque, no doubt, we are to look for the common source of Comedy, of Satire, and of pastoral amœbæan poetry.

)-

1,

ì.

8,

a

a.

s,

y

d

g

is.

28-

en

of

ac

of

to

.

as-

ce

ve

is

c.

ly it

ny

ny.

ut

es-

na nd ek

la,

We do not know whether the interlocutors in the Fescennine dialogues spoke in their own person, or assumed that of some one else, and so became actors on a petty scale. But we learn from Livy* that in the consulship of C. Sulpicius and Licinius Stolo in 389 some Etruscan artists in an expiatory ceremony executed dances to the music of a flute, and thus gave the idea of a performance composed of mingled music and acting, and hence named 'a medley,' satura. From this was developed in one direction Latin Comedy through the Atellane farce and the mime; in the other that medley of topics and metres with which Lucilius lashed the town in those open letters to the public, which were very similar in scope to the modern weekly press.

It is interesting to notice how Latin Satire reproduces some of the characteristic features of the Atellane farce and the mime, which were offshoots from a common stem. From the latter it has taken its coarseness, from the former a tendency to hold up to ridicule provincial oddities. For in the Atellane play there is no doubt that the place was originally Campania, the personages were conventional types, the language even being said to have had a tinge of Oscan. Even when these farces grew under Sulla from interludes, or improvised sketches, acted by amateur young aristocrats, into written plays performed by a company of regular actors, the scene was not Rome but some provincial town, and Pappus, Bucco, Maccus, and Dossennus

were used as stalking horses for the ridiculing of certain social

Candidate,' dealt with the humours of elections; and these conventional personages to some extent foreshadowed the harlequin, clown, and pantaloon of modern pantomime. But the favourite butts of Atellane raillery in the hands of Pomponius and Novius seem to have been municipal eccentrics, attacks on whom were then more piquant, because Italy, having saved Rome from the Carthaginians and Cimbri, then first began to ask from her something more than the privilege of shedding her blood in the defence of the Imperial City. Nothing was more pleasing to the 'Urbs' than to be reminded how absurd were the pretensions of these 'inurbani' to be placed on a footing of equality with herself. And the affectations of country magistrates is a constant theme of Latin Satire. We recall how these moved the mirth of Horace and his city friends on the journey to Brundisium, when they laughed at the decorations of the ex-clerk who was Prætor of Fundi, and who was so proud of his purple robe, his broad stripes, and his pan of coals. Persius ridicules one who thinks himself somebody forsooth, because, once stuck up with provincial dignity, he has broken short half-pint measures officially at Arretium.' Juvenal, after describing the fall of Sejanus,† asks-

> 'Would'st don the purple of that outraged corse, Or be the Mayor of Gabii or Fidenæ, Give laws upon short measures, and smash up Pint pots below the statutable size, A ragged Ædile mid Ulubræ's wastes?'

The mimes were interludes like the Atellane plays, but no longer dealt with the conventional personages, of whom Rome had become weary. They are celebrated in subsequent Latin literature, chiefly for their coarseness and licentiousness. Valerius Maximus tells us that the town of Massilia showed her regard for decency by prohibiting the mime; and Ovid‡ points out

* i. 129: 'Sese aliquem credens Italo quod honore supinus Fregerit heminas Arreti ædilis iniquas.'

† x. 99: 'Hujus qui trahitur prætextam sumere mavis, An Fidenarum Gabiorumque esse potestas, Et de mensura jus dicere, vasa minora Frangere, pannosus vacuis ædilis Ulubris?'

t "Tristia," ii. 497-504 :

'Quid si scripsissem mimos obscæna jocantes, Qui semper ficti crimen amoris habent? In quibus assidue cultus procedit adulter, Verbaque dat stulto callida nupta viro. Nobilis hos virgo matronaque virque puerque Spectat, et ex magna parte Senatus adest. Nec satis incestis temerari vocibus aures, Assuescunt oculi multa pudenda pati.' how absurd it is to condemn the moral tone of his poetry in an age in which such a form of the drama is tolerated, and largely

patronised by all classes.

One kind of satire is as old as human nature, and arises partly from a certain cruel disposition to ridicule our fellows, partly from a sentiment of justice and a feeling that there should be a social tribunal before which to hale those whom the civil tribunal cannot reach, and partly even from a more or less sincere desire to improve society. But such feelings and beliefs may find expression in the drama, as they did in the Old Comedy at Athens, or in the newspaper press and the society novel, as they do at the present time. The one original feat of Latin Poetry was to develop from the Fescennine allusion the versified letter to the public, which was unknown to Greek literature, and which has ever since given its distinctive character to Satire. Horace, whose literary judgments are seldom sound, erred in referring to the Old Attic Comedy the origin of Satire; Quintilian, who is seldom wrong, took the right view when he said, 'Satire is all our own.' This was the way which Rome chose in which to 'hold the mirror up to

Nature, to show Virtue her own feature, Scorn her own image, and the very age and body of the time his form and

pressure.'

Horace himself, perhaps somewhat inconsistently, recognizes the substantive character of Roman Satire when he alludes to it as 'a kind of poetry untouched by the Greeks.' Yet that marvellous people often came near to the idea of such a form of We can hardly recognize a nucleus of it, as some critics have done, in the Homeric picture of Thersites, but the travesty called 'Margites' was a nearer approach. The satirical portraiture of various types of women under the figure of various brutesthe fox, the mare, and so forth—by means of which Simonides of Amorgos paved the way not only for the fierce denunciations of Juvenal's Sixth Satire, but also for the Mrs. Nicklebies and Mrs. Proudies of our own day, took a further step in the same direction. When Aristophanes figured Demos as an old imbecile led about by his flatterers, he was on the threshold of Satire; and the recently discovered mimes of Herondas want little but a freer form and more unity of purpose to make them such pictures of society as we have in Lucilius, Horace, Persius, and The 'Characters' of Theophrastus present us only male portraits—a significant proof that the Greeks did not feel how powerful an instrument Satire could be made. The Greek novelists actually turned their backs on the portraiture of character, and quite failed to realize the opportunities presented by

how

n-

in,

ite

ius

ere

the

her

the

ing

re-

of

is-

ese

ney

the

of

als.

oth,

ken

fter

no

me

atin

rius

ard

out

by the novel to take up the work of Satire, and enlist the interest which it always commands.

The delight with which the Roman Satirists approached their task finds full expression in Horace and Persius. The former tells us—

"Tis my delight to build the homely rhyme, Like that in which Lucilius lash'd his time."

The latter exclaims, 'This jape of mine, trumpery as it seems, I would sell for none of your Iliads:'* and though Persius kindly says that Horace's victims smile under his lash, and that Horace plays round the heart to which he finds so ready an entrance; yet we, less prejudiced, must admit that the Matinian bee can sting, and that Horace enjoys his mockery of the world at least as much as his successor and imitator. We shall not further consider the mind and art of Horace, or his relation to Lucilius and his other predecessors, subjects which have been recently handled in the 'Quarterly Review' (No. 347), except in so far as such a consideration throws light on the literary position of Persius and Juvenal, to whom we propose to devote our attention at present.

We read that when Lucan, who was by eight years the junior of Persius, was taken, a very young man, to hear some poems of the Satirist recited, he could not restrain an exclamation. One would have been glad to know what this exclamation was, but unfortunately time has robbed us of it. Nothing remains but a mere smudge in the manuscript of the biographer.† We must own that we think!time has dealt kindly with the reputation of Lucan as a literary critic. If his exclamation had survived, it would certainly have been quoted by one class of critics as a proof of Lucan's utter blindness and obtuseness, though no doubt by another it would have been hailed as a new proof of the unerring perspicacity of the future author of the 'Pharsalia.' For about the merits of no ancient author is opinion so sharply divided. Quintilian, indeed, has declared that 'much real glory Persius earned by a single work'; but after all this does not give us the actual opinion of the great critic himself. Glory may be real (vera) and yet not deserved. Persius was

^{*} i. 122: 'Hoc ridere meum tam nil nulla tibi vendo Iliade.' Our quotations of Persius cannot be taken from any of his metrical translators, who are quite unsuccessful. They will come from the admirable prose version of Conington, slightly remodelled occasionally, merely for the purpose of bringing out some point which we may desire to make and which the translator naturally did not bring into prominence. Persius loses little by being rendered into prose, but his style has completely evaporated in the metrical versions which we have seen, especially in that of Gifford, who sometimes succeeds well enough with Juvenal.

[†] Suctonius, 'Vita Persii.'

certainly admired enthusiastically in the Middle Ages for his moral elevation, and the Fathers teem with quotations from his little book. But after the revival of learning he found few admirers save Casaubon, of whose edition of Persius Scaliger Turnebus thought said that the sauce was better than the fish. little of him, and Jerome threw his Satires into the fire. In modern times he has been edited oftener than estimated. To show that the question of his literary merit is not yet settled, we will cite two rival judgments by two eminent French critics, both characterised by the elegant pointedness and uncompromising decisiveness which the French school of criticism has made all its own. M. Constant Martha sees even in the tortuous obscurity of Persius the sacred gloom of some hallowed grove; even when he despairs of catching his meaning, he regards his text with veneration and awe, and, quoting finely from Virgil, exclaims in rapture:

' Surely a God is here: what God I know not.'

On the other hand, his eloquent fellow-countryman, M. Nisard, has protested that Persius spoiled the beautiful language in which he wrote by trying to say précieusement what had often before been said naturally but excellently well. Bad writing, he insists, comes from want of ideas. There cannot be a clear style if the thought is unformed and confused. Persius uses contortions of language to disguise the fact that he has nothing to say. If he gets anywhere a bit of gold, he is forced to beat it out thin; for it will be long before he lights on another. Hence he is really verbose, while apparently conciseness itself; diffuse and yet cramped to the verge of unintelligibility. The precision is only in his words, but it gives to his thoughts an appearance of virility which does not really belong to them. His gait is naturally short and tripping, but he rarely forgets that he ought to have a manly stride. He declares with Rosalind-

'We'll have a swashing and a martial outside.'

But while he poses, he reminds us of an old-fashioned child who

is playing at being grown up.

ir

er

ce

:;

n

st

er

ly

ar

n

UF

OF

of

ne

ut

8

IST

of

it

no

of

a.'

ly

eal es

lf.

28

ons

un-

int

nto

lly

nly

If we consider only the vehicle which Persius has chosen for his fine and sometimes sublime thoughts, we must admit that we have in him an example of deliberate eccentricity and elaborate tortuousness, quite alien from the ancient world, and hardly to be paralleled even in the present age of recoil from simplicity, in which to have a style is to be consistently and

^{*} Aen. viii. 352: 'Quis deus incertum est: habitat deus.' invariably

invariably affected. For instance, he wishes to say of a man that he is so greedy of gain that his mouth waters at the sight of gold: what he writes is that he 'gulps down Mercurial spittle'; a phrase in which we can barely grasp at a shred of meaning if we remember that Mercury was the god of treasuretrove or unexpected gain. Again, 'You are a good Stoic' is not a very recondite sentiment; but how does he express it? He must needs make a subtile allusion to the fact that the letter Y was a symbol in the Pythagorean philosophy, the stem standing for innocent childhood, and the divergent branches figuring the alternative paths of right and wrong presented to the choice of the responsible adult. How then does the simple thought 'You are a good Stoic' frame itself in words? We have to remember that Pythagoras came from Samos, and that the Porch borrowed the Pythagorean letter to symbolize the divergent paths of right and wrong, and then we can just see how Persius persuaded himself that he had conveyed the sentiment 'You are a good Stoic' when he wrote down such a portentous expression as 'the letter which spread into Samian branches has pointed out to you the steep path which rises to the right.' † In comparison with this, he is almost lucid when he speaks of philosophers 'mumbling mad-dog silence and balancing words on the pivot of their shot-out lip': 1 or of 'coins nursed at a modest 5 per cent, till they go on to sweat a greedy 11': § or when he exclaims, 'Oh that the grandeur of my rich uncle would boil over into a sumptuous funeral': or describes students of the Old Comedy as 'paling o'er indignant Eupolis and the grand old man.' Not many probably of the many admirers of Mr. Gladstone are aware that there was so ancient a claimant as Aristophanes of a name so familiar of late years in England.

It will be a good study in the style of this young philosopher, who seems to have laboured under a failing rife in our own literature at present, and to have been physically incapable of saying a plain thing in a plain way, if we examine the process to which he has subjected a few of the expressions which he has

_	***	-	4 Lame	12	31.	rialam '

[†] iii. 56: 'Et tibi que Samios diduxit littera ramos,

Surgentem dextro monstravit limite callem.'

† iii. 81: 'Murmura cum secum et rabiosa silentia rodunt,

Atque exporrecto trutinantur verba labello.'
§ v. 149: 'Ut nummos quos hic quincunce modesto

Nutrieras, pergant avidos sudare deunces '

Ebulliat patruus, præclarum funus!

[¶] i. 124: 'Iratum Eupolidem prægrandi cum sene palles.'

£

5

?

1

8

)

е

e

e

e

a

n

s

e

r

0

e

S

g

o

r,

n of

s

ed

borrowed from Horace, and which have been brought together by M. Nisard. The older poet * writes, 'Men cry out that shame is extinct'; this, expressed précieusement, becomes 'The world has lost its forehead,' that being the supposed seat of shame. Horacet gives the excellent advice to a tragic poet, 'If you want me to weep, you yourself too must first feel sad': in Persius & this is twisted into 'He will weep who would have me bow'd down under his piteous tale.' Horace talks of one who is like a perfect sphere on the smooth surface of which no speck of dust can rest: Persius' test of an elaborately perfect composition is that 'every joining should spill o'er the smooth surface the critical nail,' I that is, should allow the nail to pass over the surface as smoothly as if it were water. The idea of a joining shedding (or spilling) over a critical nail seems quite worthy of being made the subject of an essay to be read before some of those societies which profess to explain expressions in modern poetry which have puzzled the authors of them. expression might even be shown to possess the high attributes of 'divine crookedness' and 'holy awkwardness,'-qualities claimed for the style of Dante Gabriel Rossetti by a certain 'precious' editor of his poems. Too well has Persius described his own style when he speaks of the poet who 'thumps his writing desk and knows the taste of his bitten nails." **

But it is pleasant to leave the literary contortions of a young man who was a fit type of an age in which there was never less originality and never more teachers of the art of being original. Let us turn from the young rhetorician, whose style was tortured into such fantastic convolutions by the curling-tongs of Virginius Flavius and Remmius Palæmon, to the precocious philosopher whose gentle nature expanded under the influences of a cultured home circle, and friends like Cornutus and the truly noble Thrasea. Persius is chiefly interesting as the enthusiastic disciple of a philosophy in which under the Roman Empire the human conscience sought and found an asylum. Stoicism had now ceased to be a philosophy, and had become a

^{*} Ep. II. i. 80: 'clamant periisse pudorem.'

[†] v. 103 : Exclamet Melicerta perisse Frontem de rebus.'

[‡] A. P. 102: 'Si vis me flere dolendum est Primum ipsi tibi.'

^{§ &#}x27;Plorabit qui me volet incurvasse querella.'

^{||} Sat. II. vii. 86; 'Totus teres atque rotundus

Externi no quid valeat per leve morari.'

[¶] i. 64: 'Ut per leve severos Effundat junctura ungues.'

^{**} i. 106 : 'pluteum cædit . . . demorsos sapit unguez.'

religion, appealing to the rich and great as Christianity appealed to the poor and humble. On assuming the garb of manhood, Persius threw himself at once into the arms of Cornutus, and perhaps his confession of his own distrust of himself and lively personal devotion to the Stoic philosopher is the least affected

passage to be found in his work :-

'When first the guardianship of the purple ceased to awe me, and the boss of boyhood was hung up as an offering to the quaint old household gods, while my toga of manhood yet unsoiled left me free to cast my eyes at will over the whole Saburra, when the way of life begins to be uncertain, and the bewildered mind finds that its ignorant ramblings have brought it to a point where roads branch off—then it was that I made myself your adopted child, Cornutus. You at once received the young foundling into the bosom of a second Socrates. Anon your rule with artful surprise straightens the moral twist that it detects, and my spirit becomes moulded by reason, struggles to be subdued, and assumes plastic features under your hand. Aye, I mind well how I used to wear away long summer suns with you, and with you pluck the early bloom of the night for We twain have one work and one set time for rest, and the enjoyment of a moderate table unbends our gravity. No, I would not have you doubt that there is a fixed law that brings our lives into accord, and one star that guides them.' *

The Stoics did not seek to soften their teaching. The society in which Persius grew up is described by his biographer as one of high and hard thinking (acriter philosophantium), -a society having what would now be called a Puritanical bias, and an aversion for the Court, its morals and ambitions. A notable figure in this set was Cornutus, who owed his banishment to an uncourtier-like reply to the Emperor, which we confess seems to us to have been not only rude but silly. The story goes that Nero had formed a design of writing a history of Rome in verse, and was desirous of learning the opinions of his friends as to the length to which the poem should run. 'At least four hundred books,' suggested his courtiers with one voice. Cornutus being consulted opined that no one would read a work so voluminous. 'But,' retorted the courtiers, 'has not your master Chrysippus written as many or more?' 'True,' said Cornutus, 'but they are of use to the world.' We own we think that any history of any place, even though it should be by an Emperor and in verse, would have a better chance of doing good to humanity than such precepts as those which Cicero has culled from Chrysippus in his speech for Murena: precepts such as, 'The wise man ought never to pardon any fault in another, and never to repent of any sin of his own; 'All faults are equal, and it is as criminal to kill a chicken needlessly as to murder your father;' The wise man is beautiful though he be a hunchback, rich though he be dying of want, a king though he be your slave.' We think the four hundred books of Nero's poem could hardly have contained any less useful propositions than these.

Another member of this côterie was Cæsius Bassus, who is said to have edited the poet's work after his untimely death, and of whom we know nothing else except that Quintilian has told us that he was the only one of his age whom he could think of putting in comparison with Horace as a lyric poet. But by far the noblest of his associates, and the most inspiring, more by example than precept, was the heroic Thrasea; 'in whose person,' says Tacitus, 'Nero tried to murder Virtue herself.' Probably Persius had him before his mind when he wrote the noble curse on tyrants, 'Let them look on Virtue and die of the thought that they have lost her for ever.' * At Thrasea's house the young poet met Arria, the wife of the philosopher, and the daughter of the heroic Arria, who plucked the sword from her bleeding breast and handed it to her husband, with the words, 'I feel no pain but from the blow you are going to deal to yourself.' Such a woman knew how a Stoic should die at a tyrant's behest, and knew how to lift philosophy from the ridicule to which the paradoxes of Chrysippus exposed it. The short life of the poet was spent in the bosom of religious and aristocratic families, in which women were beginning to be able to exert their influence for good, as Agrippina and Messallina exercised theirs for evil. The only weakness of the whole society was a thirst for fame, 'that last infirmity of noble minds.' 'The last weakness,' says Tacitus, 'of which even the sage divests himself is the love of glory.' †

If we think of Persius, brought up in this refined atmosphere, young, very handsome, delicate, admired for his character as well as for his talents, kept far from the contact of vice not only by the natural elevation of his character but also by his physical weakness, surrounded by high-souled and admiring women, and utterly inexperienced in life, we may well expect that his work will be something peculiar and rare; and we are not disappointed. We find in him the roughness and spiritual brusqueness of one who broods much in solitude; the obscurity of one who speaks but for his own circle, which will understand what is only half said; the exaggerations of a neophyte who

^{*} iii. 38: 'Virtutem videant intabescantque relicta.'

[†] Hist. iv. 6: 'Etiam sapientibus cupido glorizo novissima exuitur.'

Vol. 177.-No. 353.

looks out at an unknown world from a Stoic cloister-in a word, we find the creed of a côterie set forth with more dry light than tempting fruit, a catechism of Stoicism which is in equal parts the poetical exercise of a too painstaking and quite overtaught pupil of rhetoricians and grammarians, and the confession of faith of an aristocratic and high-minded but very limited Persius was a conspicuously pure and good young man, who took his knowledge of vice from books, and who was only the versifier of a philosophical system which commanded his sincere intellectual assent, but did not inspire his heart and soul, as Epicureanism inspired the heart and soul of Lucretius. Hence Persius is not a good hater like Juvenal, though he says of himself that he 'wears the grin of a petulant spleen.' † The only class which seems able to make him lose his temper are the officers of the army. It was no doubt because they encouraged discontent with the military régime that Domitian banished the philosophers from the city; and indeed from the Stoic porch was most likely to emerge anything that was left of the spirit of old Rome-all who dared to band themselves against tyranny, Hence we find Persius so far forgetting and did not fear to die. the sweet reasonableness of a philosopher as to apply such a Carlylian epithet as 'unsavoury' (hircosus) to the centurions. One might fancy the epithet to be more applicable to the ragged philosopher with flowing uncombed beard who 'mumbles maddog silence' in a passage already quoted. The centurions represent to Persius the class most opposed to his teachings, and are to him what the world is to the Puritan, the bourgeoisie to the beau monde, the Philistine to Culture.

The literary ideas of Persius are much coloured by his age. When the suppression of political eloquence carried in its train a general decline in the higher walks of literature, poetry was encouraged by the Court, and hence that 'itch for the pen' (scribendi cacoëthes) of which Juvenal too complained. Persius ridicules in the first Satire the popularity of the poet, his affectation of archaism, and his unceasing struggle to attain to the sublime, 'something in the grand style to come from the heart with mighty gusts of breath'; ‡ but he is happiest when he is dealing with the incompetence of the critic—a theme which possesses in every age an irresistible charm for the literary

† i. 14: 'Grande aliquid quod pulmo anime prelargus anhelet.'

^{*} See M. Constant Martha, 'Les Moralistes,' p. 123. M. Constant Martha calls his entourage a company of Jansenists, a kind of Roman Port Royal waging incessant war with the Court.
† i. 12: 'sum petulanti splene cachinno.'

aspirant. His religious thoughts are put forward in the second Satire, 'On Prayer.' They are protests against that kind of religion which treats the gods as persons with whom a bargain may be struck, or who might even be made accomplices in crime or at least accessories after the fact. His teaching broadly resembles that which the Hebrew Prophet * sums up in the words 'I desired mercy and not sacrifice, and the knowledge of God more than burnt offerings'; and we cannot but recall 'Ho! every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters,'t when he bursts into an impassioned appeal to the world to come and eat of the corn of Cleanthes. 'From this,' he cries, 'seek ye all, old and young, a limit for your desires, a provision for the sorrows of old age.' Persius beseeches his contemporaries to live in the use of prayers to which all may listen. Christ told his followers not to court the observation of men, but to seek the throne of God from their closets. But the worshipper to whom Persius spoke sought his closet not from unostentatious humility, but because he blushed to disclose to man the vile proposals which he made to his God: 'Grant me the death of my rich uncle or my sickly ward: look at Nerius with his third wife: grant this, and all my due observances will never fail.' 'If you made such a proposal,' says Persius, 'to the most unworthy of your acquaintance, he would cry shame on you: and what do you think Jupiter will say?'s In one place the Satirist falls into an implied limitation of the omnipotence of Heaven. The gourmand prays for health, 'but rich dishes and thick gravies forbid the Gods to grant it, and lay a veto on Jupiter himself.' One is reminded of the Judge who on reading a Fenian proclamation was heard to remark, 'Aye, God save Ireland; that's the way they always begin; and that's the very thing they are making it downright impossible for Him to do.

The Christian tinge of some of the expressions of Persius has been noticed, as for instance in 'this sinful flesh' (scelerata It is extremely unlikely that Persius borrowed these from Christian writers, and far more probable that both he and the Christian writers adopted them from the philosophy of the

8

e

e

d

e

h

of

y,

ng

a

ıs.

ed

d-

ns

nd

the

ge.

ain

Was

en'

ius

fec-

the

eart

e is hich

rary

artha

Royal

Hosea vi. 6.

[†] Isaiah lv. 1.

^{&#}x27;juvenum purgatas inseris aures Fruge Cleanthea. Petite hinc puerique senesque ‡ v. 63: Finem animo certum miserisque viatica canis.

[§] ii. 9-23. ii. 42 :

^{&#}x27;Sed grandes patine tuccetaque crassa Adnuere his Superos vetuere Jovemque morantur.'

time. But certainly the whole tone of some passages in Persius is eminently Christian:—

'Give we to the Gods such offerings as great Messalla's blear-eyed son cannot give, be his dish never so big—duty to God and man well blended in the mind, purity in the heart's shrine, and a bosom full of the inbred nobility of goodness; let me have these to take to the temples, and a handful of meal will justify me in the eyes of Heaven."

Such doctrine as this is startling in its originality in a pagan philosopher, and would strike us still more powerfully, were it not that Christianity has made such teachings as familiar to us as household words during all the ages which separate us from

the time of Persius.

The morality of Persius is, as a rule, simply that of Stoicism—the Stoic war against the passions, love, ambition, luxury. But he adds something to it when he expresses his craving after true liberty. The fifth Satire has a fine description of true liberty as distinguished from that merely material freedom which Dama can get from the prætor's wand:—

'The thing we want is Freedom, not that by which every new recruit for citizenship enlisting in the Veline tribe gets a quota of spoiled corn for his ticket. What a pinchbeck age, when a single twirl makes a citizen of Rome! Look at Dama, a stable slave not worth twopence, blear-eyed from low tippling, and ready to tell a lie about a single feed of corn. Let his master give him a turn, and presto! by the mere act of twirling he is converted into Marcus Dams. Prodigious! What! Marcus surety, and you refuse to lend money? Marcus judge, and you feel uneasy? Marcus has given his word: it is so. Pray, Marcus, witness this document.'

This is the liberty the prætor's wand can give. The liberty that is of Stoicism and the spirit is far higher and far harder to achieve. And—worse still—the world wants it not, and will not don the Phrygian cap:—

'Talk in this way among the varicose centurions, and huge Pulfenius breaks into a horse laugh, and says he would not give a clipped centussis for a hundred of your Greek philosophers.' ‡

* il. 71-75: 'Quin damus id Superis, de magna quod dare lance
Non possit magni Messallæ lippa propago:
Compositum jus fasque animo, sanctosque recessus
Mentis, et incoctum generoso pectus honesto:
Hae cedo ut admoveam templis et farre litabo.'

† v. 73-81. † v. 189-191 :

^{&#}x27;Dixeris hee inter varicosos centuriones, Continuo crassur ridet Pulfenius ingens, Et centum Grecos curto centusse licetur.'

The last really weighty utterance of Persius is the expression of his conviction that the spiritual condition of the Philistine is desperate.

Juvenal offers in many ways a marked contrast to Persius, though the two are so often coupled together in editions, lectures, and histories of literature. The one was of noble family; began to write his satires when little more than a boy; and died before he had reached his twenty-eighth year. The other, the adopted (if not the real) son of a freedman, spent all his life up to past middle age in declamation, in declaiming for declaiming's sake; in urging Sulla to go into private life; or bidding Hannibal to think what a blessed thing it would be to pass his life in the advocacy of platitudes and die a good old man; or taking a part in resolving some of those hard cases which, Quintilian tells us, were devised to exercise the powers of rival declaimers. Juvenal probably did not compose anything, except mere rhetorical exercises, until he had reached twice the age at which Persius died, and did not publish until he was an old man. Again, Persius was a philosopher and nothing but a philosopher, while Juvenal belongs to no sect, and says that the only difference between the Stoics and the Cynics is in their tunics. Lastly, while the literary position of Persius is still in the scales of criticism, and his claims to the name of poet are denied as stoutly as they are affirmed, the dazzling magnificence of Juvenal's language, his strength which is sometimes fairly brutal, and his scathing fury of invective have silenced criticism and drowned the voice of protest. The arrows of his speech, headed and winged with flame, have so fierce a flight that they mock the eye which strains itself after them. The flood of indignation, pent up in furious silence for forty years, once loose carried away on its current and tossed aside every obstacle that impeded its onward rush.

While the literary merits of Juvenal are far beyond and above criticism—for who can call these in question who has not utterly forgotten the amazement with which he first read the eighth, tenth, and thirteenth Satires?—yet there are questions about certain qualities in his work which invite and have often

provoked discussion.

Was Juvenal a satirist in the truest sense of the word? Did he really abhor the vices which he lashed, or was he like the rich man in his own satire, who looked on with pleasure at the burning of his house, because he knew that it would be to him in the end a source of profit? Did he regard the smouldering fires which were eating away the heart of old Rome with the pleasure

The

LS

m

to

of

an

it

us

m

m

ry.

ng

of

om

lew

of

gle

not

lie

and

rcus

end

iven

erty

er to

will

huge

ve a

pleasure with which Nero contemplated the flames that preyed upon her streets and colonnades? Did Juvenal congratulate himself that there was such an abundant harvest for him to reap? Does the fearful realism with which he depicts vice show the extreme of fervid abhorrence or a secret pruriency and pleasure in dwelling on the details? Some of these questions are such as could only be tried in camera, and fortunately we are not bound to be the judges. We cannot get much good now out of fierce invectives against vices which do not allure but only disgust, and which—we may fairly say—have died with the Roman Empire. But we may well feel that it would have been better if some of his satires had never been written. Though he has given us the noble sentiment that there is no debt so sacred as that which we owe to the purity of the young,* yet no writer has more freely outraged modesty, or done so with more

apparent qusto.†

The little we know about his life does not afford much material for building up the poet's character from his environments-always a hazardous attempt. He saw eleven Emperors -from Claudius to Hadrian-but probably he began to write only under Domitian, and to publish under Hadrian. The most important fact which we learn from his biographer is that he spent much of his life in oratorical exercises, though he did not become a professional advocate—in declaiming for declaiming's sake. Under Domitian he wrote some verses on a favourite actor, Paris. These verses when published under Hadrian were thought to reflect on another popular artist of that day, and they brought about his fall. The Court paid back the Satirist in his own coin, by giving the octogenarian scoffer the command of a legion in Africa, an ironical recognition of misapplied ability, which really amounted to a sentence of exile.

'Easy,' cries Juvenal, 'is Democritus' smile of derision, but where did Heraclitus, the weeping philosopher, find tears

 ^{*} xiv. 47:
 'Maxima debetur puero reverentia: si quid Turpe paras, ne tu pueri contempseris annos.'

^{7†} From this point of view M. Gaston Boissier, in the works mentioned above, is the most formidable assailant of the character of Juvenal. Professor Mayor has put the rebutting case strongly and brilliantly in the Advertisement to his edition of 1886, but we must confess ourselves unable to accept his conclusions, that 'from the first page to the last breathes one spirit of homely manhood,' and that 'his standard is that of the Gospels and of St. Paul.' Yet Prof. Mayor admits that there is at least one passage (xi. 186–189) to which a virtuous motive cannot be ascribed. We think there are many such passages, which betray a desire to dwell on impure topics, rather than to show up the ugliness of vice.

enough for the folly of man?' Yet Juvenal himself has a far larger supply of tears and indignation than of laughter and gibes. He is always in a rage, and a laugh seems to sit strangely on his lips.* But his furious indignation against vice seems to have had its source rather in his head than in his heart. He is like the lion in Homer that lashes his sides with his tail, 'and mightily stirreth him up to fight.' Perhaps it may be urged that if he really thought

'Vice is a monster of such hideous mien,'

he would not have taken such pains to paint her every feature in colours that will never fade; nor would he perhaps have been so intimate with Martial; nor would that poet have addressed to him three Epigrams, two of which contain gross and irrelevant impurities. Nor yet would he, if his hatred of vice had been as real as it seems, have laughed in his sleeve at his own fervour, and wound up an impassioned invective with a sneer, as when he ends the catalogue of Nero's crimes and his comparison with the matricide Orestes by saying that Orestes never sung on the stage or wrote a Troica. In some cases so artificial is the passion into which he has worked himself that he seems completely to forget its existence for a moment. The act of cannibalism at Ombi in Egypt described in the fifteenth Satire is the occasion of a good deal of 'fine frenzy,' and many beautiful verses and pathetic passages, such as-

> 'But serpents now more links of concord bind: The cruel leopard spares the spotted kind.' †

And-

d

0

e

d

15

re

d

ne en

h

50

10

re

ch

n-

TS

ite

he

at

he

or

on

ler

of

id

an ni-

ice

on,

ars

ove,

his ons,

ayor

hich

ss of

ugh

'Nature, who gave us tears, by that alone Proclaims she made the feeling heart our own: And 'tis her noblest boon: this bids us fly To wipe the drops from sorrowing friendship's eye, Sorrowing ourselves: to wail the prisoner's state, And sympathize in the wrong'd orphan's fate,

^{*} Dr. Johnson said that the peculiarity of Juvenal was a mixture of gaiety and stateliness; but his gaiety is never more than a slight and momentary relaxation of his prevailing sternness. 'Raro jocos,' observes Lipsius, 'seepius accrbos sales miscet.' It is with a sympathetic pen that he pourtrays the moody and saturnine cynicism of Domitian in the tale of the Council of the Turbot, so matchlessly told in the fourth Satire.

^{&#}x27;Sed jam serpentum major concordia : parcit Cognatis maculis similis fera.' (159.)

Compell'd his treacherous guardian to accuse,
While many a shower his blooming cheek bedews,
And through his scatter'd tresses, wet with tears,
A doubtful face, or boy's or girl's, appears.
As Nature bids, we sigh when some bright maid
Is ere her spousals to the pyre convey'd;
Some babe by fate's inexorable doom
Just shown on earth and hurried to the tomb.'*

But all this beautiful writing leads up to the incredibly frigid question, what would Pythagoras have thought of cannibalism?—Pythagoras, who abstained from all meat, and did not even treat himself to every kind of vegetable! How strangely and suddenly the fire of indignation has gone out! Moreover, furious though he always appears to be, there is method in the madness which announces in the very first Satire that he will assail only those whose ashes fill the funeral urns which line the Flaminian and Latin roads.†

Vice may be lashed from the pulpit or the stage. Horace, of whom Quintilian says that he was without a rival in his sketches of character, chose the methods of the stage; Juvenal was driven back chiefly on the resources of the pulpit, when he made the resolution that his puppets should only represent the dead. Not that it made much difference. Society in the time of Horace was decaying, in the time of Juvenal was rotten to the core. If Juvenal had attacked the living, it may be doubted whether he would have done them much good, while it is certain that he would have done himself much harm. It would be a mistake to credit Juvenal with any heroic independence in spite of his brave words. 'What a fine contumacy and fearless boldness of speech!' we are disposed to exclaim when we meet the furious verses which tell how Domitian,

'Mollissima corda
Humano generi dare se Natura fatetur
Quæ lacrimas dedit: hæe nostri pars optima sensus.
Plorare ergo jubet casum lugentis amioi,
Squaloremque rei, pupillum ad jura vocantem
Circumscriptorem, cujus manantia fletu
Ora puellares faciunt incerta capilli.
Nature imperio gemimus cum funus adultæ
Virginis occurrit, vel terra clauditur infans
Et minor igne rogi.' (131–140.)

'drunk

[†] When he refers to persons still living, they are either quite obscure and therefore not formidable, like Machæra the auctioneer (vii. 9), or Basilus the leader (vii. 145), or else men once powerful but subsequently disgraced or exiled, such as Marius Priscus (i. 41, viii. 120). Of the deceased objects of his Satire most are taken from the reigns of Nero and Domitian. The freedmen come from the reign of Claudius.

The prostrate world which bled at every pore,
And Rome beheld in body as in mind
A bald-pate Nero rise again to curse mankind.*

But we must remember that attacks on dead Emperors were not attended with any appreciable danger in Juvenal's time. Though the Cæsars, as long as they all belonged to the one Cæsarean house, resented unfavourable criticism on deceased princes, yet we know that even then poets referred with eulogy to the open enemies of the founder of the Empire. How often has Cato been glorified by Virgil, Horace, Lucan, even Seneca, the Minister of Nero! But in the time of Juvenal to traduce a dead Emperor was sometimes the best road to the favour of the living wearer of the purple. Pliny's Panegyric on Trajan is a detailed indictment of his predecessors. The most acceptable offering to Domitian was the wounded name of those who reigned before him. The successors to the Twelve Cæsars who came to the throne through adoption or election set up the claim that they had restored the liberty of the ancient régime. Pliny compares Trajan to the Brutus who drove the kings from Rome. Attacks, moreover, on despots were the licensed and chartered themes of declamation. Juvenal tells us that he too had in his salad days given advice to Sulla to retire into private life, and draws a moving picture of the poor teacher of rhetoric ready to expire with weariness while a droning class does to death inhuman tyrants.† Philostratus of Lemnos met Ælian, a Roman sophist, with a book in his hand, which he was reading with great apparent satisfaction. Being asked what it was, 'It is,' said Ælian, 'a furious attack on the tyrant lately slain, whom I have dubbed Gymnis, to indicate his profligacy by which he has disgraced the Roman name.' 'If you had accused him in his lifetime,' said Philostratus, 'I should have admired

^{&#}x27;Cum jam semianimum laceraret Flavius orbem Ultimus, et calvo serviret Roma Neroni.' (iv. 37, 38.)

We avail ourselves of the spirited version of Gifford when it is not too diffuse. Sometimes we modify it or attempt a version of our own, where the usually vigorous rendering of Gifford seems either to misrepresent the meaning of the text, or to wander, too far from the sentiment. We would gladly have availed ourselves of the excellent translation of Dr. Leeper, the title of which is prefixed to this article, were it not that we felt that Juvenal above all other Latin poets requires to be quoted in a versified form, and that even a comparatively poor metrical garb fits him better than prose, however eloquent or exact. The editions enumerated above will be found useful supplements (especially for junior students) to the monumental work of Prof. Mayor, whose edition is, as all scholars and students know, a storehouse of learning and an enduring monument of British scholarship.

[†] vii. 151: 'Cum perimit szevos classis numerosa tyrannos.'

you. A man was needed to smite a living tyrant; any coward

could trample on his corse.'

Decidedly the most astonishing quality in the style of Juvenal is his amazing faculty for suggesting a picture to the mind. Let us observe how his fancy ever dips its wings in all the hues of the rainbow, and turns descriptions into pictures. The poet has to say, 'after the victory of Marius over the Cimbri,' but the reader must be made to think of the huge stature of these Northern warriors and of the terrible slaughter of Vercellæ, and so we have, not words, but a word-picture:—

'When carrion crows flocked to the Cimbrian slain, Crows that had never rifled huger corses.' *

Was there ever a more hideous portrait than that in the sixth Satire of a Jezebel who seeks in vain by paints and cosmetics to repair the ravages of time:—

'But tell me this: this thing thus daub'd and oil'd, Thus poulticed, plaster'd, baked by turns and boil'd, This thing veneer'd and vamp'd and lacquer'd o'er— Is it a face, Ursidius, or a sore?'†

We see the very race-course itself when we read of the winning horse-

'under whose flying feet Dances the foremost whorl of trampled dust.' ‡

And what pencil or brush could more vividly bring before our eyes the famished and mangy hound that

'Licks the dry lamp for but a drop of oil'?\$

A part of his terrible indictment of old age may be quoted; the rest is too horrible:—

'The face a parody of its former self,
Instead of skin a hideous hide, and cheeks
That flaccid hang, networks of lines and wrinkles
Such as in Tabraca's woods the grandam ape
Sitting at squat scrapes on her leathern jowl.
Between the young there's many a difference,

• viii. 251:	'Postquam ad Cimbros stragemque volabant, Qui nunquam attigerant majora cadavera corvi.'
† vi. 471 :	'Sed que mutatis inducitur atque fovetur Tot medicaminibus, coctæque siliginis offas Accipit et madidæ, facies dicetur an ulcus?'
‡ viii. 60:	'cujus Clara fuga ante alios et primus in æquore pulvis.'
§ viii. 35:	'Canibus pigris scabieque vetusta

Levibus et sicce lambentibus ora lucernæ.

Some

Some comelier, some stronger; but the old, The old are all the same, the piping voice, The tottering limbs, the hairless head, the nose Drivelling—babyhood is come again.'*

For Juvenal every conception clothes itself with colour and shape. He cannot think of Hannibal without fancying what a picture would be the one-eyed general borne on his Gætulian beast.† Marius comes before his mind's eye as stepping down from the car that bore him in triumph for Aquæ Sextiæ;‡ and Vulcan as washing the grime of his Liparæan workshop from

his brawny arms. §

Juvenal would have been more than human if the possession of such marvellous powers of description had not sometimes led him astray. And sure enough we find that some of his most graphic tableaux, however matchless for power, are irrelevant where they are introduced, and have the worst fault that an illustration could have, the fault of not illustrating. Nothing, for instance, could surpass his well-known picture of the fall of Sejanus, and the comments thereon in Rome. It is too long to quote, and is truly a masterpiece. But does it illustrate the vanity of human wishes? Not, except in so far as every reverse of fortune in history may be said broadly to exemplify the theme. It would rather serve to illustrate a proposition unfortunately not always true, and less true perhaps in Juvenal's age than in any other, that a life of the blackest infamy is likely to issue in disaster. Sejanus was no doubt ambitious, but he was also a villain without a redeeming trait. To quote his fall as an instance of

> 'Vaulting ambition that o'erleaps itself And falls o' the other,'

Et jam leve caput, madidique infantia nasi.'

* x. 191:

'Deformem et tetrum ante omnia vultum
Dissimilemque sui, deformem pro cute pellem
Pendentesque genas, et tales adspice rugas
Quales, umbriferos ubi pandit Tabraca saltus,
In vetula scalpit mater jam simia bucca.
Plurima sunt juvenum discrimina: pulchrior ille
Hoc, atque ille alio: multum hic robustior illo:
Una senum facies, cum voce trementia membra,

† x. 157, 158: 'O qualis facies et quali digna tabella, Cum Gastula ducem portaret bellua luscum.'

‡ x. 282: 'Cum de Teutonico vellet descendere curru.'

§ xiii. 44:

Brachia Vulcanus Liparæa nigra taberna.

would be like citing as an instance of Sabbath-breaking an atrocious murder perpetrated on Sunday, or condemning as want of punctuality a soldier's desertion on the eve of battle.

Another defect, arising from his very brilliancy, is that hyperbole with which Boileau charged him, and which makes him, in the words of Horace, 'assail with the terrible knout offences worthy only of the light cane.' For instance, in dealing with the nobility in the eighth Satire, he pursues with mingled curses and tears the theme of 'How are the mighty fallen!' There is nothing new in this subject, which was indeed one of the commonplaces of rhetoric and philosophy. Sallust handles it finely in the speeches of Memmius and of Marius in the 'Jugurthine War;' and Seneca had already said, 'Nobility does not lie in a hall full of family portraits dimmed by the hand of Time.' There is nothing peculiar to Juvenal's work save its amazing brilliancy. But the vials of his wrath contain no tempered liquor, and they cannot be poured out drop by drop. Hence the unmeasured and unproportioned fury of the Satirist. Hence the furious diatribe against Damasippus, the 'ostlerconsul," who with his own hands drives his horses past the ashes of the mighty dead, his ancestors: the Sun, fortunately, sees him not, but the Moon, the Moon looks down on the abominable thing, and the fires of Heaven bend on it their attesting eyes. The ostler-consul's crime of taking the place of his coachman is put beside forgery and adultery, and is one of those before which

> 'The lofty pride of every honour'd name Shall rise to vindicate insulted fame, And hold the torch to blazon forth its shame.' †

We must make allowance for the strange potency of Roman gravitas, and we must remember that Tacitus, as well as Juvenal, tells how Nero sang on the stage, in a tone only a little less awful than that in which he narrates his incest and matricide. We must recall too the indignant protest of Laberius in Republican Rome, when Julius Cæsar compelled him to take part in

^{*} viii. 148: "Ipse rotam astringit sufflamine mulio consul."

This is the recent and certain emendation of the verse, which has hitherto-

^{&#}x27;Ipse rotam astringit multo sufflamine consul.'

No doubt mulio was originally misread multo, and then multo was placed before sufflamine for the sake of the metre. Mulio consul at once makes a weak line thoroughly worthy of Juvenal. The emendation is due to Bücheler, who elicited it from the note of the Scholiast and the 'Florilegium Sangallense.' It has been heartily accepted by Prof. Mayor and all the editors.

[†] viii. 138, 139: 'Incipit ipsorum contra te stare parentum Nobilitas, claramque facem præferre pudendis,'

one of his own mimes. But when every allowance is made which far different times and circumstances can suggest, we cannot help feeling that in this passage Juvenal is breaking a butterfly on the wheel, and violating the canons of true Art.

Another curiously Roman trait is his indignation against the patrician gladiators, when set beside his apparent tolerance of the bloody sports of the circus. Pliny, it is true, congratulates Traian on the revival of the spectacles; but Cicero more than a century before the time of Juvenal had condemned the games; and Seneca had uttered the fine sentiment, 'Man's life to man is sacred.' * Juvenal finds nothing shocking in the lavish sacrifice of human life. It is not human blood, but patrician blood, which is sacred in his eyes. What shocks him is that the gladiator is a patrician, noble, and (worst of all) that he chooses, not the part of the mirmillo or assailant, but that of the retigrius or lasso-man, who seeks to baffle his armed adversary by casting a net over his head. And why is this so shocking? Because the mirmillo's face was covered, but as retiarius the noble gladiator displayed his patrician features to the gaze of the common crowd. This is desecration, this is indeed profanation of that which should be inviolate.†

Though Juvenal tells us that he takes all life, all the world, for his text.—

'Whatever passions have the soul possess'd, Whatever wild desires inflamed the breast, Joy, Sorrow, Fear, Love, Hatred, Transport, Rage, Shall form the motley subject of my page' ‡—

yet we find him curiously blind to social tendencies which were unfolding themselves under his eyes. If one were asked what class in society was the most characteristic product of Imperial Rome, we should say without hesitation, the Freedmen; and the more especially because this was the class with which the Emperors seem to have dealt according to the dictates of a fixed and settled policy, and with some just appreciation of the social force which they represented. This social force was nothing less than commerce and enterprise, and all the arts by which a man might grow rich in Rome, save only war and eloquence, which were the monopoly of the nobility. The Emperors encouraged this class as a counterpoise to the nobles, just as Louis XI, sought to create a middle class between the feudal

^{* &#}x27;Homo sacra res homini.'

[†] M. Constant Martha, 'Les Moralistes,' p. 292.

[†] i. 85, 86: 'Quidquid agunt homines, Votum, Timor, Ira, Voluptas, Gaudia, Discursus, nostri est farrago libelli.'

barons and the serfs. The influence of the Freedman expanded quickly—even under Tiberius Pallas was so powerful that, as Tacitus tells us,* 'it was counted a proud boast to be known even to his lackeys.' The development of this particular ingredient in the formation of a middle class was really a step in advance for civilization, and started the reform which ended in the abolition of slavery. But Juvenal sees in the Freedman, be he never so rich or enterprising, nothing save what is contemptible. In the first Satire he tells us, with indignation, how the very Trojugenæ are thrust aside for the freedman, whose ears bored for the ring proclaim that his birthplace was on the other side of the Euphrates, but whose five freeholds enable him to live in a splendour denied to the purest representatives of the old Roman stock.† In the third Satire, 29—40, he thus describes them:—

'Here then I bid my much-loved home farewell,
Ah mine no more! There let Arturius dwell
And Catulus: knaves who in truth's despite
Can white to black transform and black to white,
Build temples, furnish funerals, auctions hold,
Farm rivers, ports, and scour the drains for gold.
Once they were trumpeters and ever found
With strolling mummers in their annual round,
While their puff'd cheeks, which every village knew,
Call'd to high feats of arms the rustic crew:
Now they give shows themselves, and at the will
Of the base rabble raise the sign to kill.'

The colluvies of foreign nationalities which were pouring into the Imperial city with their strange rites and outlandish gods, and were changing the face of society not only morally but even artistically, found in Juvenal a supremely brilliant, but by no means profound, critic. We read how the Syrian Orontes has been flowing into the Tiber, and how the morals of the foreigners that flock to Rome are as crooked as the strange dulcimers and sistra which they carry in their train. Who does not remember his sketch of the Greeks, that nation of play-actors who will rejoice with them that do rejoice and weep with them that weep; who, like Osric with Hamlet, will say 'It is very hot,' and anon 'It is indifferent cold, my lord, indeed;' nay more, who, when you say 'It is burning hot,' can actually burst into a sweat? The picture is, indeed, vigorous, and reflects the opinion of the time. Contempt for

† i. 100-111.

^{*} Ann. vi. 8: 'Libertis quoque et janitoribus ejus notescere, pro magnifico accipiebatur.'

the Greeks had already found its way into the very tongue of Rome, in which Greeca fides meant 'dishonesty' and pergræcari 'to be an arrant knave.' But one would have expected that Juvenal should have been able to see how the Greeks by their philosophy were changing the face of Roman society. He speaks of it with contempt in a passage already referred to, where he says the difference between the Stoic and the Cynic was merely one of dress; * and he even sneers at their art in another place, where he glorifies the times when soldiers smashed up priceless miracles of Greek workmanship to adorn their steeds—a contempt for the arts of civilization which would have been a ridiculous anachronism in the Imperial City of his time. † 'I cannot bear,' he cries, 'this Græcised Rome.' ‡ Again, he tells us that the Jews worship the skies, and will not guide a Gentile to the fountain or tell him his road. Seneca had testified of this despised race that the vanquished gave laws to their victors- victi victoribus leges dedere'-a reflection on the moral influence of Rome's subjects fit to be placed beside Horace's oft-quoted estimate of the literary influence of Greece on Rome.

As to religion Juvenal laughs at it, though he ascribes to its neglect most of Rome's disasters. In Sat. xiii. 38-48 he jestingly refers to the age of Belief:—

'There was indeed a time
When the rude natives of this happy clime
Cherish'd such dreams. 'Twas ere the King of Heaven
To change his sceptre for a scythe was driven:
Ere Juno yet the sweets of love had tried,
Or Jove advanced beyond the caves of Ide.

- * xiii. 121: 'Nec Cynicos nec Stoica dogmata legit A Cynicis tunica distantia.'
- † xi. 100:

 'Tunc rudis et Græcas mirari neacius artes
 Urbibus eversis prædarum in parte reperta
 Magnorum artificum frangebat pocula miles
 Ut phaleris gauderet equus.'
- † iii. 61: 'Non possum ferre, Quirites, Græcam urbem.'
- § xiv. 97-106: 'Nil præter nubes et cæli numen adorant. . . . Non monstrare vias eadem nisi sacra colenti, Quæsitum ad fontem solos deducere verpos.'

|| Dean Merivale ('History of the Romans under the Empire,' vol. viii. ch. lxiv.) commends Juvenal and Tacitus for their protest against the encroachments of foreign ideas and sentiments, and for their hostility to everything who might seem to threaten the old principles and traditions of Rome. 'No Roman writers are more thoroughly conservative than these last of the Romans. Tacitus and Juvenal are more wholly Roman than even Cicero or Virgil. They maintain the laws, the manners, the religion of their fathers with more decision than ever, as they feel more than ever how much protection is required for them.'

'Twas when no Gods indulged in sumptuous feasts,
No Ganymede, no Hebe served the guests,
No Vulcan from his sooty labours foul
Limp'd round officious with his nectar bowl,
But each in private dined: 'twas when the throng
Of Godlings, now beyond the scope of song,
The courts of Heaven in spacious ease possess'd,
And with a lighter load poor Atlas press'd.'

In his sentiments with regard to slaves, Juvenal is almost Christian. In the fourteenth Satire he proclaims the doctrine that the slave is a man and a brother, and asks where are those who will

> 'Instil the generous thought that slaves have powers, Sense, feeling, all as exquisite as ours.'*

And one cannot forget the indignant tone of the passage in the sixth Satire, where the Roman lady, who has hired by the year a man whose sole duty is to scourge the slaves, chats with her female friends, applies her face-wash, reads her accounts, and discusses the gold border on her dress, while the eternal thong is being laid on, until the executioner wearied with his scourging flags in his work, and at last reluctantly she thunders

his dismissal, 'Begone.' †

Juvenal's sympathy with the poor is but a commonplace of his time. And what remedy does he suggest for their hard case? In the third Satire (169) he urges emigration. Seneca would have made a better suggestion, and said death. Indeed, we have very little comfortable or even positive advice in Juvenal. Instead of the thousand little precious maxims which Horace has given us for the regulation of our lives and the cleansing of our hearts, what have we from Juvenal? The cold platitude in the end of the tenth Satire, that the path to peace is Virtue. But Virtue could do little for men in Juvenal's time, save help them to die, and 'make a libation of their blood to liberty,' like Thrasea.

^{*} xiv. 16:

^{&#}x27;animos servorum et corpora nostra Materia constare putat paribusque elementis.'

[†] vi. 480-484:

^{&#}x27;Sunt que tortoribus annua præstent.
Verberat, atque obiter faciem linit, audit amicas,
Aut latum pictæ vestis considerat aurum,
Et cædit: longi relegit transversa diurni,
Et cædit: donce lassis cædentibus exi
Intonet horrendum.'

^{† *}Porrectis utriusque bracchii venis postquam cruorem effudit, humum super spargens, propius vocato questore, "libamus" inquit "Jovi liberatori. "Spects, juvenis: eè omen quidem Di prohibeant, ceterum in ea tempora natus es quibus firmare animum expediat constantibus exemplis." (Tacitus, 'Annals,' xvi. 35.)

The only class which had a sincere and serious answer ready to the question 'What must I do to be saved?' was hardly recognized as existing. Seneca does not dare to praise them, though he thinks well of them. Tacitus calls them enemies of the human race. Suetonius counts their persecution among the few redeeming traits of Nero's wicked reign. Quintilian never mentions them. Pliny accords to them a cold defence, and commends Trajan for recognizing in them varying degrees of criminality, for distinguishing hardened cases from those on whom their religion sat more lightly—robustiores from teneri. It is strange how little justice Christianity received from minds so cultivated and so amply furnished as those of Tacitus and Juvenal, Seneca and Pliny. After all, historical fairness, like self-knowledge, is perhaps better achieved by the will than by the understanding.

The fortunate side of Juvenal's rhetorical training is (as M. Constant Martha observes) to be found in the fact that it made his style an excellent representative of the spirit of his age. Had it been formed in the schools of philosophy, like Seneca's, it would probably have been in advance of his time. But in the schools of rhetoric we meet only ideas which are firmly held and widely diffused. Thus we are able to see reflected in the pages of Juvenal a jealous and exclusive patriciate crushed by the Emperors, and giving place to a middle class resting mainly on the energy of freedmen and the development of commercial enterprise. Rome becomes the home of every foreign people and cult. Among these the most finely touched are the Greeks, who succeed in imposing on Rome not only their manners but even their language, a literary phenomenon to which the works of Apuleius and Fronto bear witness. Foreign religions germinate chiefly in the slums of the Imperial city, but they gradually work into the very heart of the whole system of government and life. The prejudice against the slave begins to lose some of its force, and he begins to find sympathy at least, if no more solid blessing. The body politic is in outward semblance the same, but it contains within it seeds which are slowly fructifying, and which in the fulness of time will bring on the throes of a new birth.

ert phine on the Minnes Idea.

ART. VII .- 1. L'Art de la Reliure en France. Par M. E. Fournier. Paris, 1864.

2. The Art of Bookbinding. By Joseph Zaehnsdorf. London,

1880.

3. La Reliure Française depuis l'Invention de l'Imprimerie jusqu'à la Fin du 18me Siècle. Par MM. Marius-Michel. Paris, 1880.

4. On Bookbindings Ancient and Modern. By Joseph Cundall.

London, 1881.

- 5. La Reliure Moderne, Artistique et Fantaisiste. Par Octave Uzanne. Paris, 1887.
- 6. Les Reliures d'Art à la Bibliothèque Nationale. Par H. Bouchot. Paris, 1888.
- 7. La Reliure de Luxe : le Livre et l'Amateur. Par L. Derôme. Paris, 1888.
- 8. Manuel Historique et Bibliographique de l'Amateur de Reliures. Par Léon Gruel. Paris, 1887.
- 9. Remarkable Bindings in the British Museum. Described by H. B. Whcatley. London, 1889.
- 10. Facsimiles of choice Examples of Historical and Artistic Bookbinding. By B. Quaritch. London, 1889.

11. L'Ornementation des Reliures modernes. Par MM. Marius-Michel. Paris, 1889.

12. The British Book-maker; with which is incorporated the Bookbinder. A Journal of the Bookmaking Crafts. London, 1888-92.

13. Catalogue of the Exhibition of Bookbindings at the Burlington Fine Arts Club. London, 1891.

14. Four Private Libraries of New York. A Contribution to the History of Bibliophilism in America. First Series. By Henri Pène du Bois. New York, 1892.

THE art or craft of bookbinding has, in varying degrees, occupied the minds of literary men and book-lovers from times all but coeval with the existence of books themselves; and there have been few, indeed, amongst those entitled to the name of bibliophile who have been proof against the attraction presented by an artistically bound volume. Goethe has well described the rapture with which the keen collector hails the acquisition of a genuine old manuscript :-

> 'Und, ach! entrollst du gar ein würdig Pergamen, So steigt der ganze Himmel zu dir nieder.' *

Had the poet made mention of some choice and ancient binding—ein würdig Maioli, or ein würdig Padeloup—the line that pictures the finder's exultation would not have needed alteration.

'This seductive branch of book-commerce,' as Dibdin justly calls bookbinding, has undoubtedly been for some years past more generally popular than it has ever been before. Nor is this taste at present confined, as frequently in old times, to any one country more than another. In England, France, Germany, and the United States, the artistic revival which has taken place during the last ten or fifteen years has impressed itself most unmistakably on the binder's craft. In all these countries, for some time now, both patrons and artisans interested in the art have, in their respective spheres, been united in an endeavour to make their age, if possible, the rival of the best periods of bookbinding in better times; and it is no exaggeration to say that such efforts have been attended with a large measure of success.

Under the circumstances it is therefore a matter which calls for no little surprise, that the history of this fascinating subdivision of bibliography has until recent years remained wholly unwritten. The subject has now and then been touched upon by many writers,* in many languages, who have devoted their labours to the production of works on books and bookmaking; but the gathering together into systematic historical sequence of such scattered allusions as are to be found in the pages of these authors is a task which, we regret to say, has not yet been fully and successfully accomplished by anyone. Much, however, as we may deplore the absence of so interesting a chapter from the history of art, we are far from suggesting that its compilation is a task of any extraordinary difficulty—the list of contributions to the subject which heads this article shows it to be rather a matter within the grasp of any competent writer, who in a proper spirit sets about the achievement of the worknor indeed can we believe that the able and industrious authors of the publications we have mentioned, will be themselves content to leave the universal history of so entrancing a subject much longer without its adequate exponent. One and all, they have supplied us with charming fragments. Let us hope that one at least out of so many may be induced to complete the work which has been so well begun.

'Of making many books there is no end,' is a truer saying

^{* &#}x27;A Bibliography of Bookbinding,' by S. T. Prideaux (London, 1892), gives the titles of upwards of 450 published works devoted wholly, or in part, to the subject of Bookbinding.

now than when the prophet wrote the words; but if books be many, the readers of books are many more, and yet how few amongst them have any knowledge of bookbinding and what it means. Mr. Ruskin* may vex his soul at finding that painting is a subject in which so many people nowadays are interested. It may, however, console him to reflect that he cannot with justice find any such fault with the general public for showing too enthusiastic an interest in the kindred art of binding; for the taste for finely decorated books, though now more widely spread than ever, is, broadly speaking, still strictly confined to

the limited class described as bibliophiles.

The early history of the subject is enveloped in an almost impenetrable mist of obscurity. What are generally considered the first known specimens of the art are the terra-cotta cases. samples of which are to be seen in the Assyrian Collection in the British Museum. These ancient book-covers bear inscriptions in cuneiform characters, with a simple archaic ornamentation, and are capable of containing a small-sized volume. Next to these in point of time come the leaden tablets on which hieroglyphics were inscribed, fastened together by means of rings. After these came the Egyptian roll, the most usual form of ancient manuscripts, and the form in which books continued to be made up without any change for many centuries, being commonly found both in Greek and Roman libraries for a considerable period after the Christian era. The appearance of these rolls is too well known to need description, and it will be readily seen that their very form precluded the possibility of any great variety in the bindings; and, accordingly, the history of bookbinding-as the term is now understood-cannot be said to have commenced until a new departure from the old methods of literature took place, which consisted of folding, instead of rolling, the manuscript.

It is somewhat remarkable that the Greek writings which remain to us from classic times, give us no details as to the bindings of books; although we are enabled to collect from Latin literature a very full account of almost the entire process by which the Roman binders did their work. Cicero himself, not to mention others, tells us that the bindings fashionable at his time were already of a very costly and sumptious kind. Nor was the habit of collecting fine books in the old Roman days by any means confined to men of literary taste. We find

^{* &#}x27;The violently increasing number of extremely fooliah persons who now concern themselves about pictures, may be counted among the meanest calamities of modern society.' ('Modern Painters,' revised edition, vol. i. p. 4, note.)

Seneca* inveighing against those who were mere book-collectors, and for whom the bindings had a greater value than the contents; while Lucian wrote a treatise† specially directed to the

exposure of this common folly.

It is uncertain at what period the place of the roll was first taken by the book in folded form. Eumenes II., king of Pergamus (197 B.C.), a city renowned for its library, is generally supposed to have at least made the new shape popular. Its invention has been attributed to him, but on insufficient grounds, as the idea was in all probability derived from the Roman pugillaria, or table books, many of which have been found at Herculaneum: while the author of 'The Art of Bookbinding' gives it as his opinion that the most ancient instance of books formed of separate pages will be found in the sacred books of Ceylon, which were composed of palm leaves connected by a silken string.

With this folded form, whenever introduced, bookbinding, in the everyday sense of the term, may be said to have commenced; for the two boards which were first used as the protecting covers for volumes so made up, being attached by thread to the body of the work, were, for all practical purposes, identical with the means now everywhere adopted by binders for

the preservation of modern books.

f

ì

f

n

S

1.

n

d

In the adornment of these old-world covers we must look for the origin of artistic binding; and we accordingly find that shortly after the introduction of this new fashion in the making up of books, the worker in gold, in silver, and in copper began to be associated with the manufacturer of literary wares, and lent his aid towards the embellishment and decoration of the outside coverings in which such literary products made their appearance. The earliest specimens of bindings in this folded form were probably the productions of the Eastern Roman dominions, or Byzantine empire; and the art of decorative binding which, we may assume, sprang into existence there, continued to be practised with success for many centuries in the same locality, until in process of time it came to be transplanted from the place of its birth to the western cities of Italy and Spain; partly as the result of the visits of the Crusaders and others to the East, and partly by reason of the increased demand for models and examples of ornamental bindings which followed on the invention of printing and

* 'De Tranquillitate Animi,' c. ix.

[†] Προς ἀπαίδευτον και πόλλα βίβλια ἀνούμενον. The subject of binding amongst the ancients has been well treated by M. H. Geraud, 'Essai sur les livres dans l'Antiquité.' Paris, 1840.

the consequent multiplication of books to which that dis-

covery led.

Coming to the sixth century, we begin to find precious stones playing a prominent part in the decoration of book-covers. The famous 'Byzantine coatings,' as they were styled, were examples of this kind of ornamentation in its most lavish form. Gold, silver, and copper were commonly used to beautify the exteriors of manuscripts of the time, and jewels were freely inlaid on these metals to add an additional splendour to the volume. Of this class of work was 'the Silver Book of Ulphilas,' a translation of the Gospels made in A.D. 370 by Ulphilas, Bishop of Mæsia, which was bound in massive silver. It was magnificence such as this that provoked the indignation of St. Jerome. 'Your books,' he said, 'are arrayed in precious stones, and Christ died naked before the gate of His temple.'

The Church was, of course, in all European countries, a leading patron and encourager of fine binding in medieval days; nor was there in early Christian times a more popular gift from a high ecclesiastical dignitary than an illuminated manuscript encased in some gorgeous covering. We read that Leo III., on being elected to the purple in 795, gave splendidly adorned 'Gospels' to various churches. The Emperor Michael, about 855, was generous in a like manner; and such gifts were dearly prized, and usually received an honoured place upon the

high altar.

But surgit amari aliquid—the very nature of these costly decorations speedily brought into existence one of the worst of the so-called 'enemies of books,' the book-thief; and many were the devices resorted to for the preservation of possessions of such value from his avaricious clutches. Commonest among the contrivances adopted was the custom, which was continued for a long time, of chaining the volumes to both book-shelf and reading-desk.† Large numbers of such chained books of an early date are still preserved in many of our cathedral libraries.

To give an adequate idea of the elaborate and magnificent character of the more splendid of these ancient bindings, would occupy a greater space than is at our disposal; but those interested in the subject may feel grateful to the authors and publishers of most of the works the titles of which are to be found in the heading to our article, in the pages of which are reproduced in facsimile some of the very choicest examples of

Gemmis codices vestiuntur et nudus ante fores emoritur Christus.

medieval

[†] This plan is still resorted to, though for other purposes, in France, where, according to M. Alphonse Daudet, there are low-class eating-houses in which the forks and spoons are similarly protected.

medieval book-covers, and in a manner that leaves little to be On looking through these admirably selected and beautiful representations of artistic bindings, one may trace in a really practical way the infancy, rise, triumph, decadence and renaissance of the bibliopegistic art, and that, too, without even a thought of the distant and laborious pilgrimages which such a study would of necessity have involved in other times.

The age of Charlemagne witnessed a great advance in artistic bookbinding in France, as at that time it became the fashion to employ Italian designers and craftsmen. Many holy books too, the French Chroniclers tell us, had been brought by Childebert from Spain, a country where the ornamentation of book-covers had been highly cultivated, each of which was encased in a casket of gold; but unfortunately no examples have survived. A very magnificent specimen of Middle Age binding is described in the famous Libri Collection:-

'Manuscript upon vellum, of the eleventh and twelfth century, in an ornamented cover, forming a diptych, both sides being gilt and silvered metal, with ivory carvings, figures in alto rilievo, and enamels in taille d'épargne.'

'The book,' says Mr. Cundall, * speaking of this volume, 'contains thirty-two large ivory medallions (sixteen on each side), representing the old prophets and saints with their symbols, and having inscriptions in ancient uncial letters, the whole surrounded with a foliage of ivory work in the Greek style, with a bead ornament, carved in compartments.'

Owing to the costly character of these outward adornments, it was found necessary to provide a loose every-day wrapper for books of the kind. Such coverings were variously known as

'camisæ,' 'camisulæ,' 'manutergiæ,' or 'chemises.'

It is very clear from the accounts given of these luxurious bindings of ancient date that the binder, properly so called, played in most cases but an insignificant part in their produc-There is reason, moreover, to believe that in many countries the binder was in early times forbidden to do anything but bind, and rendered himself liable to grave penalties for any encroachment upon the domain of either the goldsmith or the writer of books. The monks, however, had from the earliest times the privilege of uniting the three crafts so denied to the secular craftsman, and the use they made of this right is best shown by the multitude of beautiful examples of penmanship, illumination, and binding, which issued from the monastery all through medieval times. Every abbey had its 'scriptorium,'

set apart for the work of transcribing and binding; and it is a remarkable fact that amongst the many members of monastic institutions who devoted themselves to the art, an Irishman, Dagæus,* who lived in the sixth century, has the honour of being described as the earliest known binder; while another Irish monk, Ultan, attained some reputation in a similar way at about the same period. Ireland, however, has never since the time of these monks produced a first-class artistic binder.

The leather employed for binding purposes in monasteries was usually made from the stag-hide, and we are told that the monks of Kenilworth had a special permission to capture the deer which haunted their neighbourhood, for the purpose of supplying themselves with this material; while a charter of Charlemagne allowed the abbots and monks of Sithen an unrestricted right of hunting, provided that the skins of the deer they killed should be used in making gloves, girdles, and covers for books. Amongst other privileged persons who were permitted to engage in the many crafts connected with book-making were princes and others of noble rank; and some of the choicest specimens of old-world binding which have survived the ravages of time, and are now treasured in our libraries and museums, had their origin in the households of such persons. Foremost among the princely patrons of the art in France was the Duc de Berri. brother of Charles V., whose library was a very treasure-house of superb bindings. In the century preceding his time, Mathias Corvinus, the king of Hungary, had formed an exquisite collection of valuable books, the bindings of which were chiefly the work of Italian artisans in his employment. But few samples, however, of Corvin's bindings are still in existence, as the bulk of them fell a prey to the Turks when they successfully invaded his dominions and sacked his library.

If it be true that but little is generally known by the public at large about bookbinding and what it means, the knowledge they possess of the technical operations connected with the binding and decoration of books is considerably less. It will be convenient therefore, before proceeding further with the history of the subject, to give a short sketch of the various processes through which a volume has to pass before it is ready to take its place beside the well-bound occupants of the bookcase of an amateur of bindings. There are no less than sixty distinct operations involved in the production of a highly-decorated volume. The whole of these various stages into

^{*} O'Conor, 'Rer. Hibern. Scriptores,' clxxvii.

which the craft of bookbinding is divided may be grouped into three main branches, known in the trade as 'preparing,' 'forwarding,' and 'finishing.' The first and second include all that is necessary for the preservation of a book; the third has to do merely with the outward decoration of the volume. In other words, 'preparing' and 'forwarding' comprehend the folding of the sheets, the gathering and collation of them when folded, the sewing of the leaves together, their pressing, the operations connected with the formation of the back, the tving on of the 'boards,' the trimming of the edges by the 'guillotine' or 'plough' (that fertile source of destruction to valuable margins), the gilding, sprinkling, or marbling of the edges, the fixing on of the 'head-band,' and the encasing of the whole in leather stretched over the pasteboard sides attached to the volume. On receiving its plain leather coat, the volume passes on to the 'finisher,' whose business it is to prepare the leather in various ways, according to its nature, for the reception of the 'glaire' or adhesive substance with which those portions of the cover are to be coated which are intended for gold ornamentation. Having settled what the pattern is to be which he intends to work upon sides and back, and, in the case of elaborate decoration, having previously lightly stamped in this pattern 'in blind,' the 'finisher' proceeds to heat his brass tools, or petits fers, to the requisite temperature over a gas stove, and to lay the gold-leaf upon the portions intended to be tooled in gold. The tools are applied hot to the gold-leaf so laid upon the leather, which retains the exact impression in gold of the tools so pressed upon it, the surplus gold being afterwards removed. Polishing and varnishing are at times resorted to, in order to give smoothness and brilliancy to the work. The 'end-papers' which form the lining of the cover are next pasted down, and the volume is sent for a final pressing, after which it is ready to take its place in the library of the owner. One and all, these processes of finishing have remained practically unchanged since handtooling was first practised, although the labour connected with the operations of 'forwarding' has been in recent years much lightened and rendered more rapid by the aid of machinery of divers ingenious kinds. The entire process looks simple in the extreme, and more particularly so the process of 'finishing,' yet some idea may be got of the complexity of labour involved in the turning out of a really artistic specimen of binding-a 'reliure de luxe,' as our French neighbours term it-when we mention that the well-known London bookbinder, the elder Zaehnsdorf, bound a volume for one of the exhibitions, on the adornment adornment of which no less than seven months of labour are

stated to have been expended.

Returning to the history of the art, we find that before printing was discovered the manufacture of books and their coverings was carried on chiefly by the Church, or in its interest,—a fact which naturally led to a certain sameness in the literature produced and the style of decorative bindings

in which such writings were preserved.

The age of chivalry however witnessed a change in this respect, as books then became much more common than before, and History, Poetry, and Romance began to occupy to a great extent the time of the copyists, whose labours had up till then been almost altogether devoted to sacred and ecclesiastical writings. This change in the contents of the manuscripts was accompanied by a simultaneous alteration in the modes of their external ornamentation, which from that period forward partook more of a worldly tone and became altogether lighter and gayer in their appearance. Ladies, too, became interested in reading. and perhaps on this account, books rapidly assumed a more portable shape. Dante does not tell us anything of the binding of the volume which Paolo and Francesca read 'to while the hour away'; but we may assume, from what he tells us of its contents, that its binding was of a character but little suggestive of the pathetic tragedy of which it was so shortly after unwittingly the cause. Our knowledge of the state of binding during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries is derived mainly from inventories, wills and accounts, and the archives of kings and princes which have come down to our time; but we have, in addition, the evidence furnished by the paintings of the old masters, in many of which the Evangelists and Saints are represented with volumes in their hands. In nearly all such cases the decoration of the volumes is of a luxurious and costly character, and there is no reason to think that the representations were not copied from books actually in existence at the time.

With the invention of printing, artistic bookbinding, in the modern sense of the word, may be said to have begun its history. Books at once became common. The rich, whether churchmen or noblemen, ceased to enjoy the monopoly in literature which had so long been their almost exclusive possession, and, as a natural consequence, the binder became a more important figure among the craftsmen of the day. The character of bookbinding became wholly changed. The massive oaken boards with huge clasps and bosses-reminding one rather of a church door than a book-cover-the inlaid

precious

precious stones, the enamels and the ivory, in which so many early volumes were encased, were one and all abandoned; and calf and morocco and parchment came in to take their place.

Of European cities Venice seems to have taken the lead in giving up the more cumbrous methods of earlier times, and soon sprang into the foremost place amongst the producers of fine work in binding. The famous Aldus employed a large number of binders in connexion with his printing press in the Venetian capital, and the excellence which they achieved in their craft may be gathered from the fact that it is believed that many volumes were bound by them for that enthusiastic and

devoted lover of good binding, Jean Grolier.

r

e

r

r

of

ıt

ts

h

ly

e-

at

he

ts

er

in

ve ne

y.

he

ng

id

There is no doubt that the tooling in gold introduced at this time as the means of adorning book-covers came originally from the East. The many relations of the Venetians with Eastern parts gave them opportunities of importing men skilled in tooling, both Arabians and Greeks, and the very character of the more ornate bookbindings executed by the earliest Italian binders shows them to have been to a great extent imitations of the richly-decorated coverings of Persian and Arabian manuscripts.* The taste for artistically ornamented books spread rapidly through the whole of Italy-nor, indeed, could it have done otherwise, with such a patron to foster and encourage the art as the renowned Thomaso Maioli. Maioli and his surroundings we know but little; so little. indeed, that it is only recently that we have even learned that he was never, properly speaking, a bookbinder. It is tolerably certain that he was still living in 1549; but, whoever and whatever he may have been, his name stands out in bold relief in the annals of binding as a man of the most exquisite and consummate taste and discrimination in the matter of bookdecoration. He possessed a sumptuous library, the bindings in which were the very perfection of the art in its highest form. The legend stamped in gold upon nearly the whole of his books is familiar to all bibliophiles-THO. MAIOLI ET AMICORUMand displays a spirit of generosity on his part which has long ceased to be a characteristic of the book-collector.† It was owing probably to this inscription that it was long thought that Maioli was himself a binder; but those who held that opinion

* Some beautiful specimens of gold tooling were produced in Syria as early as the thirteenth century.

[†] Renouard, the biographer of Grolier, mentions an instance of the more usual attitude of the collector to his book-borrowing friends in later times. A Parisian ecclesiastic had for a motto on his books the words Ite ad vendentes et emite volts.

did but scant justice to the genuine modesty of early bookbinders, who were not at that period—nor for a long time after—in the habit of impressing their names upon their handiwork.

To give any idea by mere description of the beauty of such works as Maioli possessed would be well-nigh impossible, and we can only refer those anxious to acquire some notion of what they were to the tastefully executed facsimiles which form so interesting a portion of many of the works mentioned in the title to this article. Many other names of Italian bibliophiles are recorded in connexion with the possession of bibliopegistic rarities at the time of which we speak, but none amongst them have attained anything like the notoriety which has rightly been accorded from century to century to Maioli, the founder of the more ornate school of binding in Italy. It is possible that many of the Maioli designs were adapted from Spain-a country in which artistic bookbinding had then reached a very high level-for we have the authority of that well-known antiquarian, Mr. W. H. James Weale, for saying that the stamped interlaced ornamentation on Spanish bindings of the first half of the sixteenth century surpasses in beauty and variety of design that of all other countries; a fact which Maioli would have been likely to appreciate to the fullest extent.

We have already mentioned that the journeys of the Crusaders to the East had much to do with the introduction to Western Europe of a taste for highly embellished bookbinding. In a like manner the expeditions of Charles VIII. and Louis XII. of France into Italy had an important bearing upon the progress made in the French art, which shortly after the time of those kings began to be cast almost entirely in the Italian mould. Indeed, it may be said that it was to the teaching of Italy that artistic binding in France owed its sole origin; and the French artists continued for a long period under the spell of Italian design and method, contenting themselves with merely reproducing the general forms of ornamentation in which their instructors had already attained such

marked success.

The founder of the French school of binding was the famous Jean Grolier de Servin, Vicomte d'Aiguisy, who, although born in France, had spent a considerable time in Italy, where he became intimate with Aldus and the other printers and binders of note in that country. He was employed by Louis XII. (1498–1515) and his successor, Francis I. (1515–1547), on both warlike and peaceful missions in Italy, and on returning to France in 1535 became one of the four Treasurers of the Government. He died at the age of eighty-

six in the year 1565, having devoted the greater portion of his long life with unwavering and enthusiastic consistency to the collection of books and gorgeous bindings. He brought his binders from Italy, and is stated to have himself superintended and directed almost the whole of the bindings which were executed for him. There is, moreover, every reason to believe that he designed with his own hand many of the patterns for which his books are celebrated. He was, however, ably assisted in working out the designs of some of his most elaborately ornamented bindings by Geoffroy Tory, who was well known in Paris at the time as a painter, engraver, printer, and binder, and with whom Grolier was in close relationship. Tory himself mentions in his 'Champfleury' that it was for the Vicomte d'Aiguisy that he invented antique letters. Amongst others to whom Grolier was much indebted for his designs was Estienne de Laulne, the famous engraver and goldsmith, who worked in conjunction with him on the new coinage of Henri II.

The interlacing geometrical designs now so closely identified with Grolier's name, and commonly described as 'Grolieresque,' were copied in a great measure from those found on the books of Maioli; and it is equally certain that the motto adopted by him and found so frequently on his book-covers—*10 GROLIERII ET AMICORUM—was imitated from that used by Thomaso Maioli. This legend Grolier, however, changed in the haso Maioli. This legend Grolier, however, changed in the part of his life to PORTIO MEA DOMINE SIT IN TERRA VIVENTIUM, impressed in the form of an inverted cone. M. Le Roux de Lincy in his 'Recherches sur Jean Grolier, sur sa Vie et sa

n

g

r

e

e

e

d 1-

1-

h

o, in er ed I.

y, ur

There is no necessity, of course, to put too strict an interpretation on the words 'et amicorum'; although they undoubtedly mean that the pleasure to be derived from, at least, the contemplation of the volume on which the phrase appears, was intended to be shared in some form with the owner's artistic kindred. The interpretation which is sought to be wrested from the motto by the author of 'Four Private Libraries of New York,' viz. that it was a reply of French artists to a challenge of their Italian rivals, who at times (as in Maioli's case) used the same formula, and signified that 'there was an art of book-covers, and the device meant that it was an art of France,' is ingeniously subtle, though hardly justified by a knowledge of the elements of Latin grammar; and as such is only worthy of that revolutionary upstart 'the book-lover of the decade' who, with an airy and ludicrous affectation of superiority, tells us that Canevari, Maioli, Grolier, De Thou, Hoym, Nodier, and others, 'did not know the art of bookbinding,' and 'were not lovers of books'! The writer, too, conveniently for his theory, ignores the fact that Grolier himself thought it well before he died to change his motton that a volume so charmingly brought out as is the 'Four Private Libraries of New York' should be disfigured by such childish nonsense; but the whole conception of 'the book-lover of the decade,' as portrayed in the pages of this work, is so full of absurdity and egotistical vanity, that there seems happily but little chance of any such fantastic revolution in bookbinding, being brought about as is attempted by the silly school of American fin-do-siècle innovators whose doctrines are there so dogmatically propounded.

Bibliothèque,'

Bibliothèque,' gives a list of 349 books which had been in the library of this Mæcenas of the art, the majority of which were printed in Venice; and subsequent researches have shown that

there were at least 4,000 volumes in the collection.

Grolier, like Maioli, was for a long time supposed to have been himself a binder; but there is in reality no ground for such a belief. Who his binders were it is at present quite impossible to determine with any approach to certainty: the honour has been attributed to Jean and Pierre Gascon by a French minor poet and binder, Lesné, one of the few authors, if not the only one, who made bookbinding the subject of a 'Poëme Didactique,' as he himself describes his work. But inasmuch as Lesné-'le relieur lyrique,' as he is styled by M. Octave Uzanne-did not produce his poem until the year 1820, it is manifest that he cannot be regarded as speaking with any great authority, and it is perhaps possible that the author's nationality led him to assign so coveted an honour to the craftsmen of his own country rather than to the imported Italians, who were engaged in binding in large numbers in France about Grolier's time.* Mr. Quaritch is inclined to think that all the more luxuriously embellished volumes were bound for Grolier in Venice down to the end, although French binders continued to be employed for work of a plainer kind. Grolier is believed to have been the first who had the title of the work placed upon the backs of books instead of on the sides or front edge of the leaves, where it is uniformly found in the case of books bound prior to his time. Venice was certainly at this period far in advance of any other continental city as a school of artistic binding, although some very magnificent work was being produced in Rome, Florence, and Ferrara; notably the

bindings

^{*} But for the singular nature of its subject Lesne's poem might well be passed over in silence. Some of the extant copies would seem to suggest the belief that he was determined if possible to make his book live by means of the bindings, which were also his own work, and with which he manifestly took considerable pains. In the exordium he expresses an intention of naming all the binders, good and bad, that went before him—

^{&#}x27;Je nommerai le bon et le mauvais artiste; Je chanterai les noms de ces hommes fameux Qui seront révérés de nos derniers neveux'—

and invokes Minerva and the daughters of Mnemosyne, in true epic fashion, to lend their aid. The latter would certainly appear to have remained deaf to his entreaties, as the poem shows him to have forgotten, or never heard of, many well-known names in the list of even French binders. Much of the work is taken up with minute details of the technical operations of his trade, but hardly in a form likely to prove of any practical utility. With an affectation of modesty, somewhat inconsistent with his ambitious efforts, he describes himself as a 'pauver rimeur'; and no one who takes the trouble to read 'La Reliure' will be at all disposed to question the justice of his own description.

bindings executed for Leo X., Clement VII., and others of the Medici family. So luxuriously magnificent in fact were some of these volumes that their very splendour was shortly after the cause of a rapid decay of taste in Italy, at a time when France was making speedy strides towards the pre-eminence which was This decline of the Italian art was accomsoon to be hers. panied by a new departure in the methods of impressing gold ornamentation up till then made use of. Large engraved stamps, many of them having very beautiful designs, were resorted to for the purpose of saving the manual labour demanded by the employment of a number of small tools. They were impressed by machine power on the sides of the volume, and such stamped work is at times, though rarely, found along with tooling by hand. This practice of 'blocking,' as it is called in the trade, spread quickly to other countries, but invariably with most disastrous results to really artistic work.

M. Jules Le Petit, the author of 'L'Art d'aimer les livres et de les connaître,' makes a singular remark touching the first French workmen who were entrusted with the tooling of

bindings :-

s

e

t

y

S

e

n

to

to

d

of

(S

bd

of

as

he

sed hat

ble

ers,

, to

any

ken

n a

sty, s a l be

ngs

'Il paraît que les premiers ouvriers qui furent chargés de ce travail étaient des "doreurs des bottes," dont le métier consistait d'abord à tracer des arabesques dorées sur les bottes des gentilshommes galants et coquets de l'époque.'

Be this, however, as it may, we find that the French towards the close of the reign of Francis I. commenced to shake themselves free from the Italian models in book ornamentation, and shortly afterwards attained an eminence and perfection in the art which, for originality and beauty of execution, has never been surpassed. Amongst those whose patronage led to the attainment of this high standard was Diane de Poitiers, the mistress of Henri II.; and it is generally agreed that the bindings executed for her are perhaps the finest specimens ever produced. Many of the books of this fair patroness of binding were impressed with a bow and crescent, and those she received from the hands of her royal lover bore an H with a crown and fleur-de-lis. Henri himself was also an amateur, and a large number of his volumes were stamped with the interwoven initials of himself and Diane.

This matter of devices upon books has been a constant subject of interest and inquiry to the book-lover. The meaning of many of them is by no means obvious even to an experienced amateur, as the following passage from Mr. Cun-

dall's work will show :-

'The marks upon books form a subject of some difficulty. Even those who are well versed in heraldry will, if they are not also versed in bibliography, make great mistakes in deciphering them. Some writers still maintain that the D . . . on the books of Henri II. . . . representing "Diana" is really meant for two O's, representing "Catharine." But this is only one example out of many. It is easily imagined that a book marked with the crest of a climbing adder must be from Colbert's library, the "coluber" being his arme parlante; while one with a squirrel and the motto Quo non ascendam belonged to Fouquet's binding. Books with a golden eaglet and the motto Dieu aide au premier baron Chrétien, come from the Montmorency library; those with gold fasces on a ducal mantle, from that of the d'Harcourts; three rowels or, beneath a lion passant, from that of the Maréchal de Villars; a lily-stalk points to the d'Ormessons; a greyhound to the Nicolais; a gold cross upon beautiful morocco to the Maréchal de Castries; while the double cross of Lorraine upon the back and corners of a book indicates that it comes from the library of Stanilaus, of Lunéville. These crests are easily recognized; but there are others which are perfect enigmas."

Amongst the better known devices may be mentioned the Salamander of Francis I.; the double escutcheon of Henri IV.; the three towers of Madame de Pompadour; the Daisies of Marguerite d'Angoulême—as also of Marguerite de Valois; the Golden Fleece of Longepierre; * the chariot-borne Apollo of Demetrius Canevari, and the broken pitcher of Geoffroy Tory.

The château of Anet, which contained Diane's splendid collection, continued to guard them until the year 1723, when, upon the death of the Princesse de Condé, its treasures passed under the hammer of the auctioneer; since which time the bibliopegistic wonders which it enshrined have remained scattered through various public and private libraries, many of them still retaining the freshness and colour of all their

original beauty.

Among the few names preserved to us of those whose artistic labours contributed to the making of the Golden Age of bookbinding is that of Étienne Roffet, the binder to Francis I.; but, as already stated, his royal master was not long content with the comparatively plain though excellent work accomplished by this craftsman. Bookbinding in France languished during the next reign; but a new departure in design was made towards the close of Charles IX.'s days, when the geometrical pattern of the Grolier school was augmented by the addition of

wide

Longepierre was a poet who, as such, is now entirely forgotten. The 'toison d'or' was adopted as a book-device by him to celebrate the success which attended his tragedy of 'Medea,' and apparently in the belief that his literary fame would not be as long-lived as his bindings.

wide compartments, into which a profusion of intricate and elegant gold tooling was worked. This richness of ornamentation became so common at the period that the sumptuary laws of the day make special mention of it, and a more rigid simplicity and good taste were the result. Many choicely decorated volumes have survived from this date, and amongst the choicest are those which formed part of the library of Catherine de Medicis, the mother of Charles IX. Her avarice in collecting beautiful books was greater even than that common to bibliophiles, for, according to Brantôme, she appropriated the magnificent library of the Maréchal de Strozzi, without ever fulfilling the promise which she had made to recompense his son, whose property they would naturally have become on his father's death. She kept a staff of court binders constantly employed in producing fine work. In strong contrast to the style of such lavishly adorned volumes were the books of Mary Queen of Scots, most of which were cased in black and other sombre colours, as typical of the sorrows and disappointments of her melancholy life.

In Germany the progress of bookbinding after the discovery of printing was by no means so rapid as in Italy and France. The Germans clung longer to the old and cumbrous styles, enamoured of knobs, and clasps of metal, and wooden covers of great thickness. Their first movement in the direction of change was an improvement in the style in which they had already achieved no little success—the stamping of leather-covered sides 'in blind;' that is, without gold, from an engraved block. These impressions are of almost unlimited variety and great taste, consisting, in many cases, of reproductions of the portraits and illustrations contained in the volumes which they

adorn.

f

f

d

d

f

r

h

le

of

he

ch

le

On coming to the sixteenth century, however, the German binders would seem to have almost wholly given up the earlier methods, as the Emperor Maximilian and others of his house, together with the princes of Bavaria, then became the encouragers of a style of binding which was characterised by a

davish profusion of gilt ornamentation.

The names of those who distinguished themselves as prominent craftsmen in the art at this period in Germany are more numerous than those whose names have been preserved to us from other countries; many of the German and Flemish binders having been from early times in the habit of stamping their names upon the books they bound. Among them we find Gaspar Ritter, Cornelius of Haarlem, Clement Alisandro, and Pieter Keyser. Another, Marc Lauwrin of Watervliet—more Vol. 177.—No. 353.

commonly known as Laurinus—was nicknamed the 'Grolier of

When we come to deal with the history of artistic bookbinding in England in its earliest ages, we find that a singular ignorance has, until a year or two ago, prevailed amongst all writers on the subject, both English and foreign. It has been taken for granted in every quarter that the invention of printing formed the starting-point in the history of leather-binding in this country, with the result that it has been commonly believed that English craftsmen in the art had until that time either attained no reputation worthy of mention or had not existed at all. Thanks, however, to the patient and painstaking investigations of Mr. W. H. James Weale, we now know that England, so far from being behind her continental contemporaries in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, was in reality a long way ahead of them all in this branch of the art. In the interesting articles which Mr. Weale has from time to time contributed to 'The Bookbinder,' he gives an account of the collection of 'rubbings' of bookbindings which he formed in his peregrinations among the English cathedrals and other storehouses of neglected or little-known book-treasures. We learn from him that Winchester, London, and Durham were in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries the chief centres of a wellorganized trade in bookbinding, and that there are still in existence many examples of really excellent work dating from this period.

An interesting specimen of early leather-work of a similar class is the so-called satchel of the Book of Armagh,' now in the library of Trinity College, Dublin. It is quarto in shape, and the black leather of which it is constructed is richly embossed all over with figures of animals and interlaced work. It was customary to preserve valuable books in the Irish monastic libraries in such receptacles, which were suspended by straps from the walls.

We find many instances of interlaced patterns on our English bindings of the earliest period—adopted, no doubt, from the illuminated Anglo-Saxon and Irish manuscripts of the time, in which this form of ornamentation is of very frequent occurrence. It is significant that some fine examples of this design are to be seen on the bindings of Arabic manuscripts of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries; and we may conclude that, in its general idea, this form of embellishment was derived originally from the East.

^{* &#}x27;The Bookbinder: an illustrated Journal for Binders, Librarians, and all Lovers of Books.' 1889. This once interesting periodical has, we regret to say, degenerated in recent years into a mere organ of the bookbinding trade.

The fashion of covering books with metal plaques and with silk was introduced into England about the thirteenth century, and velvet became common for a like purpose in the century after. Mr. Cundall quotes a passage from the will of a Lady Fitzhugh, made in 1427, as containing the first mention of velvet on an English binding; but it is more than likely that it had been employed previously to this date, although not specifically mentioned, for the description given by Chaucer (1328-1400) of the Oxford clerk's library would seem to point to bindings of this material rather than any other:

'For him was lever have at his beddes heede
Twenty bookes, clad in blak or reede,
Of Aristotle and his philosophie,
Then robes riche, or fithel, or gay sawtrie.'*

A speedy decline in the art of leather-binding was the result of this innovation, and the standard of skill, generally speaking, continued from this period forward to remain at a low level in England until the introduction of printing, when the great increase in the number of books at once brought about a revival

of the then almost forgotten art.

It should be remembered that the printers, booksellers, and stationers who migrated in the fifteenth century to this country from Germany, the Low Countries, and Normandy, were either binders themselves, or were accompanied by artisans who thoroughly understood the binder's business. They introduced their own stamps and tools into the country of their adoption, clinging closely to the traditions of the guilds in which they had been trained; and accordingly we find that English books in the reign of Henry VII. and during part of that of Henry VIII. bear in their ornamentation the unmistakable character of German, Netherlandish, and Norman design. For instance, upon the first bindings of English-printed books we very frequently find large heraldic devices, which, with some slight ornamental additions, constitute the chief decoration of the covers; and we know that this fashion of adornment had been much used in Germany at an earlier date. The introduction of the Tudor rose into the designs used in this country at this period was perhaps the first distinctively English departure from foreign models. It was incorporated with much effect by Richard Pynson and Julian Notary-who were both binders as well as printers—in some of their very beautiful bindings, examples of which were recently to be seen at the Exhibition of the Burlington Fine Art Club.

^{*} Prologue, 'Canterbury Tales.'

The great Caxton, of whom Pynson was a pupil, also combined the trades of printer and bookbinder. Wynkyn de Worde had also been in Caxton's employment; and on the death of his master carried on a like business on his own Other binders, such as John Reynes, Theodore Rood of Oxford, Guy Gimpus, Nicholas Spiernick and Garratt Godfrey of Cambridge, Richard Lant, Gerard van Graten, Jean Moulin, and Henry Jacobi, are known to have been practising the craft about the same time in England; but little of a

definite kind has been ascertained respecting them.

During the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries embroidered designs worked on velvet or satin were made use of simultaneously with leather for the coverings of English books; and much of the work executed by needle in this style which is still preserved shows a very considerable degree of artistic taste. The Bodleian Library contains an example of this kind of binding in 'The Epistles of St. Paul,' the covers of which were worked by the royal hands of Queen Elizabeth herself. Holbein, the artist, is believed to have sketched many designs for book-covers in his time; and it is a subject of common complaint amongst admirers of good binding in our own day that the great artists of the time do not lend their aid in a similar direction.

The geometrical strapwork patterns known as Grolieresque were introduced into England in the time of Edward VI., and certainly one highly creditable specimen of this style is still in existence, a copy of the quarto Bishop's Bible of 1569, bound for Archbishop Parker in that year, though, as Mr. Quaritch tells us, 'at a time when the English Grolieresque style (1548-1560) had already died out.' It is, however, doubtful whether work done in this fashion was executed by Englishmen or by skilled hands imported from the Continent. The latter theory is probably the more correct. For some reason, not very apparent, this Franco-Grolieresque style never took root in England.

Very large amounts were at this time paid for the binding of highly decorated books, as may be seen from the Household and Wardrobe accounts of the day, but the names of the binders are hardly ever recorded.* The notable Earl of Leicester possessed a fine collection of books, on many of which was impressed his well-known device, the 'Bear and ragged staff.' The few now still extant have been emulously sought for whenever they have

^{*} Frederick Egmondt and Nicholas Lecompte, who came to England at the end of the fifteenth century, made use of panel stamps bearing their initials and mark. They are probably the earliest English binders whose work can be identified in this way.

bears

come into the auction-room. James I. did much to encourage good binding; and John Gibson of Edinburgh, who held the office of royal binder to that monarch when still King of Scotland, accomplished some most excellently artistic work for

his patron.

The close of the sixteenth century saw bookbinding attain its zenith in France. A style of decoration had at this time crept in which differed from the Grolieresque patterns so long slavishly followed by the French artisans, consisting of an elaborate and fantastic profusion of flowers and foliage intermixed. It was known as à la fanfare. The beauteous volumes bound by Nicholas and Clovis Eve are amongst the best specimens we have of this school at its highest. The whole cover is a crowded mass of the finest and most delicate gold tooling; but at the same time so artistically arranged, that there is a complete absence of anything even approaching the garish or the gaudy. After a while the fanfare developed into what was known as the dentelle pattern, -so called from the close resemblance it bore to lace: and in looking at some of the choicer examples in this last style, we can almost fancy that the cunning artificer who wrought them had taken a piece of exquisite point d'Argentan or other early needlework, and, having deftly turned it into gold by some mysterious process, had inlaid it on the leather to form the borders of the covers he was decorating.

A devoted lover of such bindings at this period was Jacques Auguste de Thou, or, as he is more commonly called, Thuanus. He held high office under Henri IV., and had known the great Grolier intimately. His large library was filled with most beautiful samples of binding, and in every pattern then known. He had his arms impressed on many of his books by way of additional decoration, following a fashion which was very

general amongst amateurs about his time.

The next famous name connected with the history of binding in France was that of Le Gascon—a name which even now fills the mind of the bibliophile with visions of exquisite design and graceful workmanship. Of the man himself, we know nothing certain—he was, if we may be allowed to use the expression, the Junius of the bibliopegistic art. His work remains, and it has never been surpassed; but his personality is so shrouded in darkness that some notable authorities are found to doubt whether there was ever in reality such a man. M. Léon Gruel, whose admirable work is included in the heading to this article, inclines to the belief that Le Gascon was another name for Florimond Badier; and the close resemblance between works ascribed to Le Gascon and the binding which actually

bears the name of Badier impressed upon it goes a long way to support the theory.* Whoever he may really have been, it was he in all probability who bound and adorned many of the finest volumes which belonged to the Duke of Orleans, one of the most luxurious of book-collectors during the first half of the seventeenth century, and whose bookshelves are stated to have been 'covered with green velvet, with borders of the same, garnished with gold lace and fringe.'

The binder-poet Lesné mentions † Le Gascon amongst many

others, and (parodying Boileau) thus refers to him :-

'Gascon parut alors, et des premiers en France Sut mettre en sa reliure une noble élégance; Une solidité que Desseuil imita, Et que de surpasser personne ne tenta.'—(Chant i.)

The general character of Le Gascon's work is well described by the author of 'Bookbinding Ancient and Modern': !-

'He took the fanfare style as the basis of his designs, but improved on it by the delicacy of his tools and the ingenuity of his arrangement. He began with a small number of dotted tools, foliage, and the so-called seventeenth century tools; but as he progressed in originality he made more and more use of gold dottings, and in his best work these form a predominant ground on which the other patterns are shown up with marvellous effect. The gilding was the part of his work in which Le Gascon excelled; this was always beautiful, the letters and ornaments being peculiarly neat and fine. He generally chose a dull-red morocco of a peculiar tint.'

One of the most celebrated bindings which came from his hand was the 'Guirlande de Julie,' which M. de Montausier presented to Mademoiselle de Rambouillet as a New Year's gift in 1633. Many of his best productions were executed for Louis XIII. and Anne of Austria; and amongst his more distinguished patrons were the king's brother, Cardinal Mazarin, Louis Habert de Montmaurt, Jean Ballesdens, Huet, and that indifferent poet, but estimable book-collector, the Abbé Cotin.

From the year 1600 to the middle of the seventeenth century the French were the only people on the Continent who maintained their reputation as binders. All artistic taste and power of execution seemed to have become domiciled with them. Italy had been for some time on the downward path, until at last,

^{*} A considerable amount of new and trustworthy information on the subject of Le Gascon's personality is to be found in Ernest Thoman's 'Les Relieurs Français (1500-1800),' Paris, 1893. The author cites several documents, bearing dates from 1622 to 1629, in which Le Gascon is mentioned by name as being then a binder of high reputation.

about the year 1640, the art of binding in that country became all but a thing of the past, and merely the tradition of a remembered glory. The mantles of Maioli and Grolier had fallen upon the French collectors, who had now every reason to be content with the workmanship of their native craftsmen; and we find that Mazarin, about this time, when desirous to have his books well bound, was under the necessity of sending from Rome to Paris for some dozen bookbinders, whom he kept employed from 1643 to 1647. Among others whose names are well known as binders in France in the early part of the seventeenth century was Macé Ruette, who distinguished himself as the inventor of the marbled paper which is now so familiar to all in the 'end-papers' of modern books. His son, Antoine Ruette, succeeded him in the business, and was honoured by being appointed king's binder to both Louis XIII. and Louis XIV. There is reason to believe that the bindings au mouton d'or of the Chancellor Séguier were the work of his hand.

Expensive as fine binding was in old times, the original cost -as in the case of valuable pictures-can in no way be compared with the amounts since paid for really good examples of the art in its higher forms. Exceptional value, of course, attaches to bindings set with precious stones, such as the small volume of Latin Gospels, said to have belonged to Charlemagne, which is reproduced in the first plate of M. Léon Gruel's 'Manuel.' It was recently bought for 1204l. But the history of bibliography in late years shows us that well-authenticated samples of merely tooled leather bindings-in themselves intrinsically valueless-have been sold at very astounding prices. A copy of Catullus bound under the eye of Grolier was disposed of at M. Hebbelinck's sale in 1856 for 2500 francs; while the 'Farmers-General' edition (1762) of La Fontaine's 'Contes,' in a mosaic binding of Padeloup, which had been once purchased by the bibliographer Brunet for 13l., was eventually sold for 560%.

Another small volume in a Grolier binding, the Aldine Virgil of 1527, gives us in its history an excellent idea of the increase which has recently taken place in the value of choice examples of the art. It had once been in the library of Renouard, and at the sale of his books had produced 1000 francs. Subsequently, at the Solar sale in 1860, it brought 1905 francs; and five years later, at the Double sale, was sold for 2850 francs. It again changed hands in 1873, when Sir Richard Tufton's library was auctioned in Paris, bringing no dess than 5000 francs. Of late binders, Francis Bedford, of London,

t

London, would seem to be most highly valued in the open book-market. An edition of the 'Italy and Poems' of S. Rogers. in two volumes, bound by him, was sold in 1890 amongst the books of the late Sir Edward Sullivan for 1031. The catalogue describes it as being 'in citron morocco, covered with minute gold tooling relieved by variegated leather, lined with red morocco, ornamented with rich gold tooling, vellum fly-leaves, gilt gaufré edges,' and states further that the volumes were frequently exhibited by Bedford himself as the finest specimens

of his skill in bookbinding.

In the seventeenth century, England, although a long way behind France in the matter of tasteful binding, was still producing some very excellent work. Many different materialswere at this time made use of for covering books by the English craftsmen in addition to leather, such as metal, ivory, tortoiseshell, and embroidered velvet or silk. It was to the last-named style that Nicholas Ferrar and his relatives at Little Gidding chiefly owed the great reputation they acquired as bookbinders. Ferrar and his family-amongst whom was his niece Mary Collet-devoted themselves in their retirement in Huntingdonshire to learning the art of bookbinding in all its branches; and they succeeded in turning out some very beautiful-if not unique-volumes. Their decoration consisted in the main of elaborate embroidery on a ground of velvet or silk; but there are specimens of their handiwork in tooled morocco which reflect the highest credit on the inmates of the Protestant Nunnery—as their establishment came to be called.

With the opening of the eighteenth century the art of the binder in France began to show symptoms of decline. Therewas no lack of richness in the designs then fashionable, but it was the richness of vulgarity in taste where every form of incongruous ornament was crowded and huddled together uponsides and backs of books with little or no regard to artistic harmony and balance. Many volumes of the time bear a strong resemblance to a gaudily and richly dressed woman, whose bonnet and boots, whose flounces and feathers, though each most costly of its kind, together produce, by inappropriate and offensive combination, an effect which is filled with unpleasant-

ness to an eye of taste.

Louis XIV. was in a measure to blame for this decadence in artistic propriety; and his example and patronage proved too strong for the efforts of such a tasty binder as Boyer, who endeavoured to check the rank luxuriance into which bookdecoration was rapidly running. The Jansenists, too, whohave given their name to a style of binding characterized by

severe plainness, did what they could in the same direction as Boyer, but were no more successful than he was. The work done by the Abbé Duseuil, however, forms a remarkable exception to the want of taste which then prevailed. He was a lover of good bindings, and devoted his leisure hours to-practising binding as an amateur. He was especially renowned for his mosaic or inlaid work, in which a crowd of small pieces of different coloured leathers are attached to the morocco with which the volume is covered, and harmonized and softened by means of the gold tooling under which they are, so to speak, imbedded. It is in this style we see in its most pleasing and perfect form what the late Laureate well calls

'A border fantasy of branch and flower.' *

Boyer and Duseuil are stated to have been the first who made frequent use of the 'doublure;' that is, the casing of the insides of the cover with richly ornamented morocco in addition to the external embellishment. The practice had been occasionally resorted to before they made it common, and its more universal adoption in their day was probably one of the results of the craving for luxurious display to which we have already adverted as prevailing at the time. It is a branch of binding which has since been much cultivated; and, more especially in recent years, some very exquisite workmanship in gold tooling and inlaying has been expended on the interior covers of richly-bound volumes in most European countries.

Little is known of Duseuil beyond what we mention, and inthis respect he shares the obscurity which hangs round many famous names in the history of bookbinding. The authors of 'La Reliure Française,' indeed, go so far as to assert that most of the work for which he has got the credit was done by Augustin Duseuil, a native of Provence, who was related by marriage to the Padeloup family. The question of his identity is, however, one which it would be manifestly impossible todiscuss within the limits of a summary like the present.

There are many names of well-known patrons of finely-bound books which are preserved to us from this period; the most notable of which are those of the Duke of Orleans, Louis XV., Cardinal Dubois, Cisternay di Fay, Madame de Pompadour, and Count d'Hoym. The last-named, who was Polish Ambassador at Paris in the beginning of Louis XV.'s reign, possessed a very magnificent library, every book in which bore

the arms of the owner on its sides in gold.

The Padeloup family, to whom we have already had occasion to refer, were the next binders of any note in France. They had been known from much earlier days as a family of bookbinders and printers, no less than thirteen of the name having been successively in the trade. The greatest of them, Antoine Michel Padeloup, became binder to King Louis XV. early in that monarch's reign, and his mark is found on the bindings, amongst others, which belonged to Queen Maria Leczinska. Solidity of workmanship was the most noteworthy feature in Padeloup's binding; for he too-as shown by the greater part of his more intricate designs-had come under the influence of the degenerate taste of his time, although he occasionally turned out specimens of mosaic work in which the blending of the colours employed proves him to have been in this respect a very accomplished craftsman and a man of high artistic appreciation. His bindings are at present eagerly sought for by collectors, and 1001. is a sum not uncommonly asked for a

good example of his work. Many of the books bound by Padeloup are distinguished by a small ticket (étiquette) attached to the back, or inside cover, recording the fact that he was the binder-a means of perpetuating the author's name, adopted first by him after Le Gascon, and one which in later times became very common. Padeloup was undoubtedly the best binder of his age, albeit a declining one; and although there were other luminaries of lesser brilliancy still shining at the time of his death, he may be looked on as the Evening-star of bookbinding in France. With him passed away the last of the line of really great artists, whose works constituted the meridian glory of the bibliopegistic art of France and of the world. Of his immediate contemporaries, the next after himself in point of skill was Derôme; although it is by no means easy to determine which of the Derôme family was then the guiding spirit and head of the binders of the name. Like the Padeloups, the Derômes had been in the binding business for a very long time. The number of books bearing Derôme's ticket is exceedingly large, and the credit for binding them is, perhaps not unnaturally, somewhat indiscriminately assigned by booksellers to the most skilful of the class, who was probably Jacques Antoine Derôme, the contemporary of the great Padeloup. Solidity rather than elegance was the leading characteristic of the Derôme bindings; but some specimens of their earlier work in the dentelle pattern are looked upon as the very perfection of that most attractive and charming style. A rare copy of La Fontaine's 'Fables,' in two small volumes, bound in their establishment,

establishment, has been sold for 520l. The daughters of Louis XV. had each a small library of books, bound by the Derômes, and impressed with the royal arms of France surmounted by a ducal coronet. The books of the Princess Sophia were all in citron morocco; those of her sister Victoria, in olive green; while the Princess Adelaida had her volumes bound in red. Touching the value of these three choice collections of bindings, M. Uzanne tells us: 'Les ouvrages de

cette illustre provenance n'ont plus de prix.'

d

e

a

r

le

of

er

n.

a

of

ay

e.

ts,

ic

n-

as

of

les

he

ge, ly,

he ine ity

the

ork

ion

of

ent,

Derôme bound only in whole morocco; and the greater portion of his bindings bear on the backs, between the 'bands,' the gracefully designed bird with outspread wings which has remained as the most distinctive mark of his work. The introduction of the flat back in the binding of books has been attributed to the last of the Derômes-Derôme le jeune, as he is called in his own country. It was a style which did much to facilitate the perfect opening of the volume, at all times a sine qua non in a really well-bound book. Rich binding was much encouraged in France in both the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries by many women of rank, chief amongst whom were Madame de Pompadour, Madame du Barry, and Marie Antoinette; but in spite of such patronage the art steadily languished, and although the gloom is occasionally relieved by such names as Pierre Paul Dubuisson, Enguerrand, Le Monnier (who worked with Padeloup), and Biziaux, artistic taste and skill remained at a low level until we reach the first quarter of the nineteenth century, which witnessed a distinct revival in both execution and design.

The Revolution with all its concomitant horrors was no doubt the chief cause of the final debasement of the art. In that time of Socialistic triumph it would have been a matter of difficulty under any circumstances to find opportunities for indulging so luxurious a taste as the collection of finely-bound books; but any inclination in this direction was effectively checked by the laws of the time, which forbade the binding of books in anything but déshabille. Many beautiful specimens of binding, and more particularly those which bore the arms of the nobility, were ruthlessly destroyed in the spirit of Vandalism which then prevailed. Louvet and Mercier especially distinguished themselves as the enemies of fine books, and made it their business to tear the morocco covers off any well-bound volume that fell into their nefarious clutches. One indignant book-lover of the time was stirred to poetic rage by these proceedings, and ventured to publish an epigram against

the more notorious Bibliopégiphobe :-

'Mercier, though down upon the binder's art,
Ere long, perhaps, for your own skin you'll quake:
Yet, no—that hide's too coarse—be of good heart,
Naught of it but a drum-head could we make.'*

Mercier was himself an author, and, with appropriate consistency, had all his works enveloped in a covering of the worst paper-'papier à chandelles'; and, in reference to these publications. M. Uzanne takes leave of their author with the wish - 'Puissent-ils rester éternellement dans leur chemise originelle en mémoire de leur impitoyable auteur-iconoclaste! Bozérian, it is true, was a more or less successful binder during the Revolutionary period, and afterwards attempted to raise the tone of the art to its old status; but in the plainness and severity of much of his binding we can see, only too clearly, traces of the restrictions under which even his work was accomplished. Thouvenin was more successful in his efforts to effect improvement; and, adopting the old models, he produced a large number of bindings very little inferior to the masterpieces of his most illustrious predecessors. He died in 1834, after having laid the foundations of a school of first-classbinders, amongst whom were Niédrée, Duru, Capé, Simier, Purgold, Courteval, Lortic, and the famous Bauzonnet. The last mentioned of these-a pupil of Purgold-produced, inpartnership with Trautz, some most charming specimens of good workmanship, equal in every respect to the chefs-d'œuvre of the best days of French bookbinding. The work was, however, almost entirely imitation, not creation. He reproduced the tools of earlier days, and so fertile was his power of designing that he is stated never to have executed two bindings exactly alike. His inlaid or mosaic bindings show him in particular to have been an artist of the highest order; and the prices paid in recent years for examples of his best work afford practical proof of the almost extravagant value now put by lovers of finely-bound books upon the very exquisitely adorned volumes which issued from his hand.†

Upon the death of Bauzonnet, Trautz continued to trade in his own name, and ably upheld the great reputation created by Bauzonnet and himself when working together.

^{&#}x27;Mercier, en déclamant contre la Reliure, Pour sa peau craindrait-il un jour? Que ce grand homme se rassure, On n'en peut faire qu'un tambour.'

[†] Mr. Cundall mentions that at a late sale in Paris an Elzevir bound by him, the utmost value of which unbound could not have been more than 1001., was sold for 6401.

Amongst the more successful of the immediate followers of Trautz were Thibaron and Cuzin—both excellent craftsmen; the brothers Lortic, who worthily carried on their father's trade; Motte, Marius-Michel et fils, Amand, Chambolle—the

successor of Duru-David, and Smeers.

e

e

n

S.

.

e

n

ıf

·e

s,

)-

of

75

n

1e

d

y

dbe

in

Dy.

gst

At the present day Paris continues to produce much work which, in point of finish, admirable taste, and execution, may fairly be compared with much of the very best workmanship accomplished in the zenith of French bookbinding. Messrs. Gruel and Engelmann may be mentioned more particularly as a firm who for many years have devoted themselves in a truly artistic spirit to the production of bindings of the very-highest order, at all times availing themselves of the extensive historical knowledge of which one of their members has shown himself to be possessed as the author of the 'Manuel Historique et Bibliographique de l'Amateur de Reliures' mentioned in the heading to our article.

But to return to the history of the subject in our own country. It may be said that bookbinding took its place as one of the English arts in the eighteenth century; and, being favoured with a liberal encouragement on the part of those whose means allowed them to indulge so costly a taste, it made rapid advances, becoming year by year more impressed with a distinctly original and English character. Cambridge was first to set an example of a completely new style, by producing a species of mosaic work which had all the appearance of being inlaid, while in reality the different colours were the result of an application of acids to the leather. Some pretty effects were produced in this way, but the style never became very common, although requiring no very careful manipulation in its execution.

The earliest specimens of solid workmanship of a purely English type about this period were what are known as the Harleian' bindings. The name, which has since become a technical term amongst bibliographers, was derived from Robert Harley, the first Earl of Oxford, who employed Messrs. Elliott and Chapman to bind his library at a cost of 18,000l. It is a style which is well suited for literature of every kind. Red morocco was generally employed, the ornamentation consisting of a broad tooled border composed of alternately varying sprigs, surrounding a centre panel.

The efforts of the next English binder, Thomas Hollis, were directed to the execution of devices appropriate to the particular character of the contents of the books which he bound. Many craftsmen, both before and since the time of Hollis, have

endeavoured

endeavoured in various ways, and with more or less success, toimpart to their bindings a character emblematical or suggestive of the contents of the volume. In its more simple form this object has at times been sought to be achieved by the adoption of different colours in the leather, as a means of distinguishing one class of literature from another. M. Ambrose Firmin Didota weighty authority on matters relating to the science of bibliography—considered that the 'Iliad' should be bound in red, and the 'Odyssey' in blue; giving, as a reason, the tradition that the Rhapsodists, in Homeric times, wore a purple cloak when reciting the Tale of Troy, and a blue one when their song was of Ulysses. According to the same authority, violet was the appropriate colour for the works of high dignitaries of the Church, and scarlet for those of cardinals; philosophers should appear in 'inky cloak'; poets should wear rose-colour. It would not be difficult to replace these arbitrarily-chosen colours by others for the adoption of which reasons quite as good might be readily furnished; and yet we know that the responsible heads of the British Museum Library have been long accustomed to bind their books on theology in blue, those on history in red, works of the poets in yellow, and works on natural history in green. og fatter of and

The celebrated Roger Payne made some slight efforts, in the same direction as Hollis, to adorn his books with tooling of a character appropriate to the work-as, for instance, by putting a vine-wreath on the cover of a volume dealing with a rustic subject. Mr. T. J. Cobden-Sanderson, a well-known amateur binder of our own day, has dwelt on this subject in some interesting lectures delivered in London; and he may be regarded, by reason of the vigour of his opinions on the matter, to be the chief champion of the emblematic school in England. This gentleman, who has succeeded at exhibitions in carrying off the prize from some of the best of our modern professional binders with his most carefully executed and tasty work, goes so far as to say that the binder, and the binder only, should determine the nature and the style of ornament in which a volume should be covered. He holds that the true binder artist should not be so dependent upon the fickle taste of the public as he is at

present: - Gottalasmana aft

'The aim of the craftsman worthy of the name'—he tells us*—'is too high to be controlled. He should have more liberty, more scope in which to exercise his gifts to produce things of use—and, in his happiest moments, also things of beauty. Things of beauty are

^{*} Lecture on Bookbinding: 'The Bookbinder,' vol. ii. p. 76.

beyond all price. Price alone cannot produce them. So a beautiful binding is made not to order—that is impossible—nor to gratify the vanity of the public, but as an act of worship to the genius of some great writer whose book it clothes and would perpetuate. The binder should be, to fulfil his high task, besides craftsman and artist, a man educated. He must know, himself, what is beautiful in literature, and be his own master in the choice of the beautiful books which he shall bind.

Mr. Cobden-Sanderson thinks and writes in the spirit of an artist undoubtedly, though many would not hesitate to pronounce his opinions to be of too Utopian a kind for every-day life. It is certainly difficult nowadays to conceive the realization of his high ideal, more particularly when we remember that even the late Poet Laureate, who could not be charged with any lack of either noble feeling or education, had occasionally to bow to the requirements of the time, and pen to order a stanza or an ode in celebration of some event unworthy alike of both his genius and his artistic instincts.

It must be manifest to men of ordinary minds a class from which there is no reason to exclude those who desire to have their precious books arrayed in worthy raiment-that hard and fast canons dealing with what is to a great extent a question of taste can never meet with a very general acceptance. It would seem to us more natural-if it be necessary to adopt anything in the nature of a rule on the subject-that the bibliophile should seek to regulate the binding of his books by a consideration of the uses to which they are intended to be applied, rather than in seeking to make the covers in some fanciful manner representative of the contents. Obviously, a volume destined for wear and tear should not bear the livery of one intended mainly for ornamental purposes, or as M. Alphonse Daudet wittily puts it, 'for external use only': but to determine by any form of rule the particular colour and style of dress and decoration which a volume, say, of early sonnets should wear. as distinguished from a 'Decameron' or the 'Vicar of Wakefield,' would appear to be a task little less difficult than that which the leader of an orchestra finds himself called upon to perform, when blandly requested by the performing conjurer to strike up 'a few bars suggestive of the borrowing of half-a-crown.' Looked at from another point of view, the difficulties attending any such efforts will be even more apparent; for if we take some choice example of richly-decorated work from the best days of bookbinding, and obliterate the title, we shall find it easy to mention many hundreds of works, of entirely diverse characters, which might be encased in such a cover without

ë

\$

e

S

18

e

d

e

at

is pe

re

 $\mathbf{n}\mathbf{d}$

even a suggestion of inappropriateness or want of taste.* The great binders of the past do not seem to have troubled themselves overmuch on this score; their artistic instincts would seem to have kept them straight in the matter, and to have led them in their happiest efforts into adopting as their guiding principle a maxim in many respects similar to Polonius' sententious phrase:—

'Costly thy habit as thy purse may buy, But not expressed in fancy.'

We have referred to the French Revolution as the culminating element of destruction to the art of binding in France. Its effects upon the art in England, however, were, happily for our countrymen, of a very different nature. In consequence of the reign of lawlessness then existing in their native land, a large number of French exiles, skilled in the craft of bookbinding, found their way to our shores. The practice of bookbinding in its higher forms had been followed by many amateurs of rank in France as an amusement about the close of the eighteenth century; and some of them during their involuntary residence in London succeeded in turning their knowledge to account by establishing themselves as members of the trade for the purpose of making a livelihood. Of these, the Comte de Caumont had a boutique in Portland Street, and afterwards in Frith Street, Soho Square, and attained a considerable reputation for the excellence of his work. A good many other refugees are mentioned as having devoted themselves professionally to similar pursuits; and, like the earlier foreign binders who came to this country, they adhered closely to their own style of workmanship.

With the latter end of the eighteenth century came Roger Payne, perhaps the most celebrated of all our English craftsmen in the art. The history of this remarkable artist is in many respects a melancholy one. Possessed though he was of talents of an exceptional order, he was pursued throughout his life by the demon of drink. The irregularity of his habits and the squalid nature of his surroundings are only too accurately shown in the portrait of him which is to be found in Dibdin's Bibliographical Decameron. He is represented in this picture as a gaunt, unkempt, and shabbily dressed old man, standing 'lean and slippered' in his miserable workshop; a glue-pot on the fire, and a few implements of his trade about him; but 'in this place,' to quote from Arnett's interesting little book,

† 'Bibliopegia; or, the Art of Bookbinding in all its Branches.' London, 1848.

The absurd notions entertained on this subject by some American bibliophiles have been already referred to.

were executed the most splendid specimens of binding, and here, upon the same shelf, were mixed together old shoes and valuable leases, bread and cheese, with most costly manuscripts

and early printed books.'

Payne was one of the few binders who performed all the operations connected with his trade himself. He cut his own tools and letters, and coloured his own 'end-papers,' in addition to doing the entire work of 'forwarding' and 'finishing' his books. His first instructor in the art was Pote, who did the binding for Eton College, and he was afterwards apprenticed to Mr. T. Osborne, a bookseller in Holborn. All his work as a binder was done in the intervals between frequently recurring bouts of intemperance; but in spite of his constant craving for the means of indulging himself, his charges were always remarkable for their unusual moderation. He made it a habit to furnish his patrons with bills which contained a detailed account of the labour he performed on each of the books entrusted to him for binding; and many of these interesting documents have been preserved in connexion with the works to which they refer.

As an instance of the value at present attached to Payne's work, we may mention an Edinburgh edition of the 'Old and New Testament' of 1715 bound by him, and described in the bill which accompanies the volume as 'finished in the richest and most elegant taste, richer and more exact than any book I ever bound,' which was sold in the library of the late

Sir Edward Sullivan in 1890 for 621.

r

y e y s

e

n

re

Richard Weir, who with his wife had been employed, in succession to Derôme, in binding and repairing the library of Count Macarthy at Toulouse, was at one time in partnership with this erratic artist; but as both men were equally addicted to intemperance, their business connexion was not of long duration. They were perpetually quarrelling when working together, and so violent at times did their disputes become that Payne is stated * to have composed a sort of 'Memoir of the Civil War' which was continually going on between them.

Payne died in 1797 in extreme poverty. The most notable binders who came after him in England were John Mackinlay—for whom Payne had occasionally worked—H. Walther, H. Falkner, Charles Hering, John Whitaker (the introducer of the 'Etruscan' style); the four Germans, Baumgarten, Benedict, Kalthoeber, and Staggemeier; Holloway, Archibald Leighton

(the inventor of cloth-binding),* and Charles Lewis. Many of Kalthoeber's bindings were remarkable for having paintings on the foredge of the leaves,—a pleasing style of decoration, chiefly

identified with the name of Edwards of Halifax.

In the matter of taste and mechanical execution, C. Lewis was undoubtedly by far the best of all these workers. Dibdin speaks of him in terms of the highest commendation; and indeed it would be difficult to name any other English binder amongst his predecessors whose workmanship can be regarded as superior to his. He bound for some time in connexion with Clarke, who is deservedly esteemed for his work in the less ornamental styles, and who eventually became the partner of the well-known Francis Bedford.

The most celebrated names in the late history of bookbinding in England are those of Francis Bedford, Robert Rivière, Joseph Zaehnsdorf, and Roger de Coverly. Of these, Bedford is in all probability the one who is most justly

entitled to the foremost place.

The French binders of the present day have all reached a very high level of perfection in their craft. We may in particular single out for honourable mention MM. Gruel and Engelmann, MM. Marius-Michel, Cuzin, Motte, Amand, Ruban, David, Champs, and Allô. In the lightness and delicacy of their finish, the regularity of their execution, the marvellous smoothness and softness which they impart to their leather. and, above all, in the beauty and surpassing taste of their designs, the French show themselves to be in no sense the inferiors of their great predecessors. It would be an idle and invidious task to institute a close comparison between them and our present binders in England-a task which is rendered all the more difficult by reason of the narrowness of difference which now divides the styles of high-class binders in both countries- Palmam qui meruit ferat'-but others must undertake, if so desirous, to arbitrate on claims so evenly balanced.

Touching the progress of the art in Germany at the present time, we find that there are many binders there whose work is of the best kind. Berlin has its Vogt and Wilhelm Schmith; Düsseldorf, its Carl Schultze; Munich, one of the few towns which possesses a school of bookbinding, has its Altenkofer. The last of these has gained a high reputation as a successful worker in almost every style of decoration, although as a rule we find a strongly marked tendency in the modern German

^{*} Mr. Cundall gives 1826 as the earliest date at which a book was published bound in cloth; forgetting that Pickering's miniature editions of Dante and Tasso were both issued in this form in 1822.

binders to reproduce the patterns of the Middle Ages rather than the lighter forms of ornament of a later date.

Belgium boasts some excellent binders too; and, in the New World, we find Matthews of New York so well established in the first rank that M. Uzanne, writing from the French point of view, has to acknowledge that his work may fairly be com-

pared with that of MM. Marius-Michel.

d

١,

IS

ir

e

d

m

ce

h

T-

nt is h; ns er.

ful

an ned and ers

We may mention, in closing, one matter in which the interests of artistic binding may be served by a change. There have been at all times, and there are still, many amateurs accustomed to array works of a vicious and debasing character in the gorgeous and costly apparel which of right belongs to books of a higher and a purer kind. The occasional rarity of such works is, of course, the bibliophile's excuse. But is it his justification? Mr. Andrew Lang reminds us, in 'The Library, of a famous French amateur who boasted that his collection of bad books was unique. That of an English rival, he admitted, was respectable,— mais milord se livre à des autres préoccupations'! A man of vice masquerading as a cardinal can never command the respect of honourable men; no more can a bad book in sumptuous attire attract the admiration of the true artist. An era of welcome change will have begun whenever such collectors have learned the honest wisdom of Lady Capulet's remark :-

for fair without the fair within to hide:
That book in many eyes doth share the glory
That in gold clasps locks in the golden story.**

and notes a series of against above or dispression. Districted with the control of the control o

Charles I worker and Landau don and Louis as personal by

and here about the Training of Superior of Superior Superior Superior and Land Superior Super

^{* &#}x27;Romeo and Juliet,' i. 3.

ART. VIII.—1. La chute de l'Ancien Régime. Par Aimé Cherest. 3 vols. Paris, 1886.

 Histoire de Marie-Antoinette. Par Maxime de la Rocheterie. Second Edition. 2 vols. Paris, 1882.

3. L'Esprit révolutionnaire avant la Révolution. Par Félix Rocquain. Paris, 1878.

THOUGH so much has been written about the French Revolution, its history has, every now and then, to be carefully re-studied from a novel point of view; either on account of newly-discovered facts, or owing to the publication of fresh and luminous views, by some distinguished writer. Such was the case when De Tocqueville showed how much of what had been deemed novel in that movement was but the carrying still further of the principles and practices of the despotic monarchy. The works of M. Taine have also necessitated the careful reviewing of that complex social transformation, in the light furnished us by his elaborate labours.

The first of the three works mentioned above will, we are persuaded, have a permanent effect on the world's judgment. It describes many facts hitherto unknown; and it demonstrates an important factor in the movement which has hitherto been little noticed. Unhappily, M. Aimé Cherest did not live to finish his valuable work, and its last chapter breaks off abruptly

where his hand was arrested by death.

The Revolution of France still remains very incompletely understood in England, owing to an insufficient appreciation of the vast administrative differences between the two countries which existed towards the close of the eighteenth century.

In spite (perhaps somewhat in consequence) of the despotic character and excessive centralization of the French king's government, divergences existed between the political organization and administration of the various French provinces such as had not existed in England since the Heptarchy. Different provinces having been successively annexed at different epochs and on different conditions (although these conditions had often been set aside), many curious anomalies occurred. The local legislatures (les états provinciaux) of Hainault, Dauphiny, Franche Comté, Provence, and Languedoc had been suppressed by Richelieu or Louis XIV., and numbers of municipal franchises had been abolished. Yet in Provence a democratic assembly still survived, and Béarn showed administrative relics of the kingdom of Navarre.

The most striking difference between France and England at the accession of Louis XVI. in 1774 was in the tenure of landed property, and in the position held by men of the most distinguished class. Instead of large estates let out for definite periods to farmers and others on rents agreed upon, an immense number of the nobility possessed no freehold property (beyond a château with its mill, wine-press, or public oven), but they had vexatious rights with respect to dovecots and sporting, various claims on labour, and some receipts and privileges in respect of the just mentioned ovens, mills, and wine-presses. The rise of a class of non-noble land-owners was, except in the case of the very rich, effectually barred by the mode of levelling the land-tax. The nobles who possessed estates paid no such charge; but if they sold any of their landed property to purchasers who were not noble, then the land became immediately subject to heavy taxation.

Notwithstanding the writings of De Tocqueville, it is still widely believed that peasant proprietorship and the great subdivision of landed property in France are a consequence of the Revolution. Such a belief is quite erroneous. The peasantry somewhat resembled our copyholders, but the claims of French lords of manors (seigneurs) were oppressive, though the proprietorship of the soil by such copyholders was distinctly recognized. They regarded themselves as the owners of the soil, subject to certain oppressive customs, claims, and dues; and the seigneurs, though generally exacting the latter (often their only source of revenue), never claimed the absolute proprietor-

ship of the soil.

But the great subdivision of the land existed even in the Middle Ages. The land so famous for the production of Chablis was, as early as the year 1328, divided among no less than 450 small proprietors of both sexes; all inhabitants of a single parish. It is doubtful whether that land is as much subdivided in the present day. There were only two large proprietors. One was the Chapter of St. Martin of Tours, and the other was the Abbey of Pontigny. M. Cherest himself has carefully studied the rent-roll of the Abbey of Vezelay as it existed towards the end of the fifteenth century. In a volume of nearly 800 pages, bearing date 1464, he found* that the Abbey possessed the freehold of but a small part of the arable land, all the rest being divided among small, or very small, proprietors. Even the humblest inhabitant held something. On the list are to be seen the plots belonging to the shoemaker, the barber, &c.; and of the part which formed the vineyards there were almost as many proprietors as inhabitants.

During the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries the multitude of peasant proprietors increased, as a larger quantity of land was brought under cultivation. The attachment to the soil which the peasantry seem to have felt for ages, no doubt constantly increased, and during the eighteenth century, owing to the increasing luxury and expense of life, many nobles were glad to sell their lands and even their manors; and they could, for the most part, sell them only to the peasantry,—the middle class being restrained from doing so by the before-mentioned system of taxation.

Thus on the eve of 1789 multitudes of the French peasantry had become proprietors, and the desire for the possession of land became a passion. At the same time their natural dislike to feudal burthens developed into a hatred of the whole system of which those burthens formed a part. This feeling made the peasantry bad labourers even when paid for their labour, though they were never tired of cultivating their own parcels of land: for they were continually called upon to labour for nothing by their seigneur for reasons which, however just originally, had long lapsed from the memory of their generation.

In the eighteenth century, while many of the nobility had little land, all of them had lost their ancient functions. Royalty had deprived the seigneurs of powers which might interfere with and inconvenience the direct local action of the central government; and it had perverted such powers as it had permitted to survive.

Originally the seigneur was a little king in his seigneurie, which he governed with the help of his court of justice. In the eighteenth century he no longer governed anything; and though his local 'court' continued to exist, it was but a vexatious survival, superfluous beside the Royal Courts of Justice. The seigneur had become merely a troublesome creditor, possessing certain vexatious claims, made doubly offensive by a proud superiority of caste. The nobility were no longer a political power, but to the enormous majority of Frenchmen merely a source of social vexation.

The term l'ancien régime is used by M. Cherest in a special sense; namely, to denote the period which elapsed between the death of Louis XIV. and the Revolution. In fact the social and political state which existed from 1715 to 1789 was in many respects different from that which prevailed during the long reign of the Grand Monarque; and, of course, from that of medieval France, when a multitude of local franchises existed, when nobles and ecclesiastical dignities fulfilled many important political as well as social functions, and when the States-

General,

1

-

0

e

d

d

to

m

le

T,

ls

OT

st

n.

ad

ty

re

ral

er-

ie,

he

gh.

11-

he

ng

ud

cal

y a

ial

the

ial

in

the

hat

ed,

or-

tes-

al,

General, however inefficient and irregularly convoked, were a recognized and still living institution. That period-a period of relative freedom-may be distinguished as the medieval régime; and this led, through the Valois and Henri IV., to the period of despotism, or the especially regal régime, made up of the reigns of Louis XIII. and Louis XIV. During the remaining period of the old monarchy the royal omnipotence continued to be asserted, and was, till towards its close, theoretically admitted. Privileges and exemptions were maintained, and even became exaggerated. It was a period during which a prolonged struggle took place between a more or less insurgent nobility, a feeble regal absolutism vainly striving to maintain itself, and the gradual awakening of the modern spirit of 'equality before the law' and of political and social freedom. This state of things is, as we have said, what M. Cherest means by l'ancien régime. Its end may be considered as having taken place in November 1789, when the ancient division of the French people into the three estates of clergy, nobility, and the tiers état was formally ended. Its spirit, however, survived during the Emigration, and was still vigorous under the Restoration, nor can it be said to have entirely vanished till the death of the Count de Chambord.

M. Cherest assures us that he began his researches full of prejudice in favour of the system, the fall of which he depicts. As a strong Conservative, he would have been glad to vindicate it from the blame so generally heaped upon it. Nevertheless, at the end of his studies he felt bound to declare himself in the words of Mirabeau: 'A Conservative indeed, but a Conservative of that which the Revolution has created, not of that which it justly destroyed.' Though the sufferings of Louis XVI. and Marie Antoinette must induce a reluctance to judge them severely, even pity should not blind us to the fact that they were guilty of grave faults and of actions impossible to justify. Yet it is no less certain that, had their faults been far greater and their morality and weakness much less, they might have become the most powerful and despotic sovereigns of modern times. They came to the throne at a moment which gave them wonderful opportunities.

On the 24th of January, 1771, three years before his death, Louis XV. had prepared the way for his successor by the memorable coup d'état of his Chancellor Maupeon, by which the 'Great Council' was created, in the place of that ancient court, alternately the ally and the opponent of royal despotism—the often factious Parlement * of Paris; and by the end of the year

^{*} It is better to use the French name for French judicial bodies. Parliament, with all its English associations, seems a singularly unsuitable term.

the various Provincial Parlements were also suppressed. In spite of the excitement which ensued, France, from a habit of obedience during two centuries, was still so docile that her discontent for the most part only showed itself in witty sayings in the salons, and in some pamphlets; so that till the death of his master the Chancellor was confident and triumphant.

The condition of France was then in many respects admirable; and if only that which was good could have been retained, while crying abuses were reformed, a solid advance in civilization might have been secured, and might possibly have been imitated by the whole of Europe. The refinement of Versailles and of the salons of Paris was such as the world had never seen, and probably will never see again. Talleyrand said that he who had not known society before 1789 had not known the sweetness of life. In spite of the disorders of the Court, of the Regent and Louis XV., and of the worldliness, corruption, and infidelity of fashionable abbés and some other ecclesiastical dignitaries, the great mass of the clergy and laity were essentially sound in faith and morals. De Tocqueville has shown the general excellence of the clergy, both as parish priests and citizens; and the troubles of the Revolution served afterwards abundantly to demonstrate their sincerity and devotion. As to the laity, a singular proof of the moral sentiments of the middle and artisan classes has been curiously demonstrated by the lettres de cachet found in the Bastille.

But moral corruption and impiety were rank amongst the highest classes, whose hostility to Christianity was no doubt largely due to the writers of the 'Encyclopédie' and their allies. But this hostility had also its aristocratic side as a sign of culture and of social distinction from the vulgar, for whom religion was good and useful. Thus the Duc de Beaumont said of himself: * 'I attend Christian worship on account of my belief in its political utility.' The grandfather of the now President of the French Republic is declared to have had his anti-aristocratic feelings first roused, by military ridicule directed against his piété de bourgeois. Nevertheless such sentiments were far from universal; while their evil effects were mitigated by a widely-diffused interest in social progress and an increasing passion for scientific know-The chemist Fourcroy had twice to seek a larger theatre, so great was the crowd of gentlemen and elegant women who attended his lectures. Antoine Petit's course of anatomy was so popular that even the bases of the windows

^{*} See Forneron's 'Histoire Générale des Émigrés,' vol. i. p. 23.

were used as seats. Geology and zoology were taught by Buffon, electricity by Noller, astronomy by Lalande, and the doctrines taught were discussed round many an elegant and fashionable supper-table. Deparcieux was invited each year to the Château of Brienne, where he found a collection of Natural History and physical instruments for his use during the course of lectures given by him to the ladies who passed the summer with the Archbishop. The names, too, of Coulomb, Malus, Lavoisier, Berthollet, Guyton de Morveau, Daubenton, Bichat, and Lamarck must not be omitted, nor those of Antoine de

Jussieu and Romé de Lisle.

n

S

1,

0

S

d

d

d

O

d

le

st

10

d

ic

ie

e

n

e

is d,

8.

le

n

V-

er

nt

of

VS.

re

Very important politically was the society of 'Economists,' which began in 1767,* and had the Minister Turgot for one of their most celebrated representatives. Their most ardent desire was to put an end to 'abuses,' by which they meant the inequality of taxation and the oppressive feudal dues. The disorder of the finances imperatively called for a remedy which should guarantee the future; and such a remedy could plainly be alone attained by a fair taxation of the privileged classes. Those classes themselves denounced abuses, though as a rule each one demanded the abolition of those by which he did not benefit, and was extremely tenacious with respect to those which were of advantage to him. Thus though the privileged orders had much jealousy amongst themselves-jealousy on the part of the provincial nobility against that of the court, and jealousies of cassock, sword, and gown-there was nevertheless a general readiness to coalesce against any assault from citizens who were unprivileged. Still liberal aspirations were very widely diffused, and the friends of progress were full of hope on the advent of a young King known to be good and well disposed; so that his accession was celebrated far and wide with transports of emotion. The first acts of the young Sovereign encouraged these hopes. The King dispensed with his right to 'joyous accession,' which meant an economy of 40,000 livres, while the Queen renounced her right to 'the royal girdle,'-acts which were followed by the writing by an unknown hand of the word resurrexit on the pedestal of Henry IV.'s statue.

The King further delighted the nation by dismissing the despotic Chancellor Maupeon (when Paris was spontaneously illuminated and the Minister burnt in effigy), and summoning the celebrated Turgot. Turgot was universally esteemed as an honest man, and had been adored in Limousin, where he had served as Royal Intendant. His first act was to

^{*} Rocquain, p. 263.

do away with provincial corn-taxes and establish free-trade in grain throughout the interior of France; his next was to abolish the system of forced labour known as corvées. He was nevertheless a strong advocate for absolute power, and what he desired was 'a patriot King.' He joined Maupeon and various Bishops in urging the King not to restore the Parlements, and he was also strongly opposed to any elective assemblies. He wished to establish a universal system, a hierarchy, of municipalities (the members of which should be nominated by the King), with a grand national municipality in the place of the States-General. To any convocation of the latter he was strongly opposed, as tending to deprive the King of his absolute legislative power. His object was that Louis should reform abuses and re-organize the nation by his own spontaneous acts. It was in the King's full power so to do, and he was encouraged in the path he should have pursued by the words of that great Empress and Queen whose daughter he had espoused. On May 30, 1774, Marie Thérèse wrote* to Marie Antoinette: 'France has immense resources: there are also enormous abuses, but these latter are themselves a resource, since by their abolition the King will obtain the benediction of his people. The prospect is indeed fair and noble.' There was yet time. Thirteen years later nearly the same words were repeated to the Assembly of the Notables by the King's Minister Calonne. But it was then too late.

Indeed, as we have already observed, Louis XVI. had the opportunity, had he also possessed the requisite intelligence and firmness of will, to acquire more power than had been possessed even by Louis XIV., and to become a sort of legitimate and peaceful Napoleon; yet with a far more stable authority, since the traditional loyalty to, and reverence for, its kings had not then been weakened in the French nation, and indeed amounted to a passion which it needed but a judicious course of conduct

to intensify.

To gain that absolute power which Louis XVI. might have secured, two preliminary measures were necessary. One was the promotion to the magistracy of many men belonging to the tiers état; the other was reform in the army. Much improvement in the treatment of the 'rank and file,' especially as regards their nourishment, was needed; an improvement which would have secured its discipline and fidelity under all circumstances. But another reform was no less needful, and this was

^{* &#}x27;Correspondence,' published by MM. d'Arneth and Geffroy, vol. ii. p. 155, quoted by Cherest, vol. i. p. 4.

the throwing open of all commands to competent men who did not belong to the nobility.

e

e

a

e

n

e

is

n

d

ie

d

ie-

0

e,

of

35

re

er

le-

d

ed

nd

ce

ot

ed

ct

re

as

to

ch

ly

ch

n-

as

55,

he

We have no right to expect that Louis should not have been a man of his own times. Yet a French monarch might have been more, for Mirabeau was much more than this; and, as we have seen, Marie Therese understood the opportunity. The King, however, had no clear mental grasp of the situation; he was indolent and weak, and so infirm of purpose that Monsieur (afterwards Louis XVIII.) declared it to be as difficult to make him adhere to a resolution, as to hold together billiard balls which have been dipped in oil. Moreover the King, while strongly impressed with his rights as an absolute monarch—rights he had no disposition to surrender-had, as was natural, great sympathy with the class to which all his intimate friends belonged. He doubtless shared in that mode of regarding 'privileges' which was common to the society of which he was the head and summit. Moreover, the very scrupulousness of his character helped to disable him from acting the great part which was open to him. He was averse to any interference with property; and the feudal rights and dues of the nobles were in his eyes, as in the eyes of almost all the higher classes, only one form of property. Thus it was, unhappily for the King and far more unhappily for France, that this great chance of a peaceful transformation of the ancien régime was finally lost. alleluo outo

Turgot was far from being allowed to arrange matters in his own way. Unfortunately the King had called to his aid the elderly and frivolous Count de Maurepas—a man whose sympathies were entirely with the abuses and corruptions of the old system. Thus, in spite of Turgot, the Parlements were restored. Louis XVI. caused letters to be written to all the exiled magistrates, ordering them to appear in their places at the Parlement on November 12, 1774. There and then the King held a 'bed of justice,' whereby he restored the old state of things and undid the work done by Louis XV. and his Chancellor Maupeon.

What Turgot had foreseen soon happened. The restored Parlement refused to register the King's beneficent edicts. It openly declared itself in opposition to Turgot, and sent a deputation to ask the King to retract his decrees,* declaring that 'the occupation of the nobility is to defend the country against its enemies, that of the clergy is to edify and instruct the people, while the duty of the rest of the nation (incapable of performing such lofty services) is to pay taxes, promote

^{*} Rocquain, p. 345.

andustry, and carry on manual labour.' It seems to have been after these representations that Louis XVI. said: 'I see very well that there is no one but Turgot and I who really care for

the people.'

For a time the King persevered, and on March 12, 1776, held a 'bed of justice' and forced the Parlement to register; to the delight of the masses, who were transported with joy. But very few, save the lower classes, supported the Minister. He was criticized and ridiculed in the salons. Of all this he took small heed, relying too much on reasoning and frigid demonstration, and not taking sufficient account of the far more influential action of sentiment and prejudice. He was neither considerate nor conciliating, and did not try to 'manage' even the King himself. Gustavus III. wrote of him two days after the 'bed of justice': 'M. Turgot has opposed to him a most formidable league, consisting of all the great personages of the kingdom, all the Parlements, all the financiers, all the women

of the Court, and all the religious world.'

The Queen must have felt the influence of such hostility among her entourage; but, as our readers will remember, it was a personal feeling of her own which led her to a fatal act. Turgot caused the recall from London of the Count de Guines, who was one of her favourites, and she determined to be revenged on him. She obtained for De Guines the title of Duke; and though she could not, as she wished,* consign Turgot to the Bastille, she secured his dismissal, on May 12. Then, after a brief interval, came the first Ministry of Necker, followed by that war with England for sustaining the Revolution in America, to which so terrible a Nemesis succeeded. But after the fall of Necker, five years later, a period of frank and determined reaction commenced, towards the end of which the first movements of revolt were set going by the greed and ambition of the privileged orders. The reaction began under Maurepas and Joly de Fleury. Then, instead of insuring the fidelity of the army by popularising it, a regulation was made (in 1781) to the effect that any one seeking to become an officer must produce a formal proof of four degrees of nobility, without counting the applicant's own. There was to be but one exception-in favour of sons of Knights of St. Louis. Thus a special section of the privileged orders secured a yet further increase in their privileges, and this but eight years before the assembling of the States-General, which was the beginning of the end! When Louis XV. came to the throne, no such

^{* &#}x27;Hist. de Marie-Antoinette,' vol. i. p. 226.

restriction existed. Any man could become an officer without proving even one degree of nobility. In 1750, so far from closing the door against the just emulation of the Third Estate, the King not only kept the door open, but promised to bestow on commoners who were officers of distinguished merit, the much-coveted recompense of hereditary nobility.* The irritation which the regulation of 1781 excited among the less ancient nobility and the members of the Third Estate was profound, while it did not secure the fidelity of the officers to the King's-government.

The reaction was not confined to matters military. Whereas formerly very distinguished members of the higher clergy and the magistracy had been members of the Third Estate, no members thereof were any longer to be tolerated in either of those bodies. Bishoprics were reserved for persons of quality. and it was settled at Court that none but nobles should bemade abbots or other superiors of religious houses. The holdersof fiels, from one end of France to the other, began to examine into their feudal claims, with a view to the restoration of any of them which might have fallen into desuetude—a restorationto which the Parlement was ever ready to lend a helping hand. In Provence the feudal reaction had gone so fart that the seigneur of the village du Pennes insisted on his vassalscoming to do homage in the ancient form; namely, on their knees, bare-headed, and so swearing allegiance with their handson the Gospels. The feudal régime had never been felt to be so detestable as after the fall of Turgot and Necker. Men's hearts became sick with hope deferred. The King and his government had promised much and raised great expectations; after which evils that had for a moment been put an end to, were not only restored, but aggravated.

At the very same time royalty visibly enfeebled itself; the King undoing the work of Turgot and of Necker, as he had previously undone the work of Maupeon. Nevertheless, the King retained great popularity, and on the birth of the Dauphin ‡ was received with loud acclamations on his road to Notre Dame, while at the Opera there were loud cries of 'Vive le Roi! Vive la Reine! Vive Monseigneur le Dauphin!' Nevertheless, some persons were sent to the Bastille for distributing writings hostile to the Queen. But there was much disapprobation of the fêtes announced to take place on January 21, and a placard was discovered posted up, on which it was

e

-

e

r

n

r

e

n

y

18

t.

s,

d

d

ıe

a

y

in

er

nd

he

 \mathbf{d}

er

he

de

y,

ut

us

er

he

ng

ch

on

^{*} Cherest, vol. i. p. 19. † Ibid. p. 72. † Ibid. p. 72.

written that on that day the King and Queen would be escorted to the Hôtel de Ville to confess their crimes, and then burnt

alive at the Place de Grève!

The Parlement of Paris continued docile during this period of reaction, but some provincial courts began to resist the imposition of taxes, and that of Besançon called for the resuscitation of the provincial estates of Franche Comté, and for the convocation of the States-General. This was on the 17th of

July, 1783.

By the intervention of the Count d'Artois, Calonne was appointed Minister towards the end of the same year. Under his dexterous management, though the finances were not really improved, the public were dazzled with an appearance of prosperity, and his own friends and supporters were gratified: he paid the debts of the King's brothers, and bought the palace of St. Cloud for the Queen. The harvests of 1784 and 1785. were very good. It was a period of enchantment, when all seemed prosperous and flourishing, and when society at Paris was brilliant and animated. The King, ignorant of the true state of his finances, was proudly rejoicing in the termination of a contest which had humiliated England, and seemed to have restored France to the rank it held before the misfortunes of the Seven Years' War. The country, under the sway of a gracious prince, seemed given up to the enjoyment of the charms of a civilization softened by the progress of ideas. Privileges indeed continued; but, when not contested, their possessors, under the sway of the prevailing sentiment, very generally made them forgotten by a refined graciousness.

But what directly concerns us here is the bursting of the bubble of apparent prosperity through the forced declarations of Calonne himself. This led to a renewed, and henceforth unceasing, attack on the exemptions of the privileged orders, with a consequent uprising of those orders against royal absolutism, and appeals to revolt and military disaffection on their part. They thus set going that revolutionary disorder from which they themselves suffered so quickly and so cruelly. Calonne, forced at last to disclose the real state of the finances, and feeling sure that the only possible salvation—the taxation of the clergy and nobility-would be opposed by the Parlement, resolved to call together an Assembly of Notables, hoping that by the moral force of such a gathering he could overcome the Parlement's resistance. The failure of this Assembly is well known. and the Parlement of Paris struck the key-note of revolution by itself repudiating the powers it had so long and strenuously

sserted

asserted. It began by a vexatious opposition to the first attempts of the Government to extend somewhat the area of taxation by means of a Land Tax and a Stamp Act. On the 16th of July, 1787, it assembled to prepare an address to the King, begging him to withdraw these two edicts. It also requested that an account of the states of receipts and disbursements might be communicated to them. All of a sudden a voice was heard to exclaim: 'It is not states of accounts we want, gentlemen, but the "States-General!"' The idea met with a modified acceptance. The Parlement did not refuse the Stamp edict, but rather excused itself from either accepting or rejecting it, and adopted a formula carrying with it grave consequences. Its words were: 'The nation alone, as represented in the States-General of the realm, can give assent to taxation. The Parlement has no such power. . . . Charged by the Sovereign to announce his will to the people, it has never been charged by the people to act as its representative.' This act of self-abnegation-indeed of selfstultification-has a patriotic aspect. But subsequent events showed clearly that the Parlement of Paris and all the other Parlements were far more concerned about maintaining the dignity and augmenting the power and wealth of the privileged classes, than about the welfare of the entire nation.

1

e

n

0

-

e

at

35

ot

g

ed

ne

ns

th

is,

al

on

er

y.

es,

on

nt,

by

le-

vn, bv

sly

ed.

This animus was soon made sufficiently evident. On the 6th of August, 1787, a 'bed of justice' was held at Versailles, whereat M. d'Aligre, the President of the Parlement, in protesting against the proposed laws, affirmed that they tended to engender discord between different members of the same family, and between 'seigneurs' and 'vassals.' This indicated what their feelings really were, and what was the real gravamen of the changes they objected to. The proposed laws not only taxed the seigneurs, but allowed their vassals, assembled in parish meetings, to see that the charges were distributed equitably. On the 13th of the same month the Parlement met, and there and then affirmed once more that the King could not lawfully impose a tax without having previously convoked and consulted the States-General. In the preamble to this affirmation the magistracy again showed plainly what was their real object in urging on the convocation of the Therein they declared it to be 'contrary to the principles and primitive constitution of the nation, which would be adhered to by the States-General, that the clergy and nobility should pay territorial taxes in common with the tiers état'-adding that it had been reserved for their days to see

^{*} Chere≥t, vol. i. p. 276.

such a system even proposed. The Parlement thought that, thanks to an adherence to ancient custom (as announced by them), the clergy and nobility having two votes to the one of the tiers état, would easily maintain their existing privileges, even if they could not acquire new ones. Little by little the-Parlement began to court popular favour. It had always been the rule for the magistrates to keep their proceedings secret, but now they accustomed the public to be told their resolutions as soon as passed, and a crowd was encouraged to wait within the halls of the building and applaud the members as they issued forth from their great chamber. The people came toregard as a right the immediate communication to them of what had been done, and the Archbishop of Paris was insulted for refusing to reply to such questions. Thus a precedent was established for those tumultuous demonstrations whereby the mob influenced and sometimes intimidated members of sub-

sequent governing assemblies.

It is unnecessary here to portray or discuss the struggles which ensued between the Government and the Parlement. Great and important changes had taken place in the provincial organization and administration of France-changes which served to show, on the one hand, the persistence of the higher orders in seeking to maintain their privileges; and on the other the fruitful and beneficent results of more moderate and patriotic conduct on their part, as in the province of Dauphiny. The idea put forth by Turgot of giving Provincial Assemblies to the whole of France, had been modified and submitted to the Assembly of Notables by Calonne in February 1787. His proposition was that a local assembly should be instituted in every province which had not preserved its ancient Provincial Estates. In these new Provincial Assemblies, though there were to be members of all the three 'orders,' they were to deliberate in common, and votes were to be taken, not by order, but by counting heads. The history of these Provincial Assemblies has been more accurately examined by M. Cherest than by preceding writers, and therefore deservesa fuller consideration than we have given to the previous events, which are better known.

The clergy and noblesse were very well disposed to welcome Provincial Estates which might enable them to hold in check the Intendant of each province, who was appointed by the King. They also desired the convocation of the States-General, that they might be enabled effectually to overcome the despotism of the Government. But the estates or assemblies they wished for were bodies organized in the traditional

fashion,

fashion, so as to give a preponderance of two to one to the privileged orders. It was small wonder, then, that the newly-devised assemblies were opposed by the Notables, and also by the Parlement of Paris, which only registered by compulsion the decree establishing them. They also encountered a strenuous local opposition. Thus Hainault protested against the decree, and demanded the restoration of their ancient provincial estates, which had been arbitrarily suppressed. If, they said, Louis XVI. wished to undo the faults of his predecessors, it would be best to restore the old order. The prayer was acceded to, and on the 8th of February, 1788, a royal declaration was registered by the Parlement of Douay, restoring the estates, but ordering them to deliberate in common and vote by counting heads, the members of the Third Estate being also made to equal in number the two higher orders taken together.

The Province of Guyenne never possessed 'estates,' but the Parlement of Bordeaux none the less opposed the institution of the new Provincial Assembly, as a violation of their privileges. Though exiled, it defied the Government, refused to register the royal decree, and invoked an Assembly of the States-General. Nevertheless, towards the end of 1787, the Provincial Assemblies began to meet in those provinces in which their union had not been prevented by opposition on the part of the local Parlements. The arrangement was that half the members should, at first, be nominated by the King, and these were to elect the other half. Then, every year, one quarter of the members were to retire, to be replaced by others chosen according to a very complex system of election.

;

e

d

y d

,

1,

e

S-

e

1-

al

But the system of royal nomination disappointed its authors. It was not from members of the Third Estate that any special opposition came. It was the clergy and noblesse that offered opposition on the ground of the power exercised by the Royal Intendant of each province. Thus the Duc d'Ayen, from Haute-Guyenne, and the Archbishop and Duc of Rheims, protested vehemently against the presence of the Intendant, which excited the disgust of its members. Often aristocratic influence succeeded in overcoming that of the Prime Minister. Thus the Royal Intendant of Lyons, having become engaged in an acrimonious dispute with the Assembly of that province, the great lords and prelates made such use of their influence at Versailles that he was compelled to submit.

The most interesting and instructive local conflicts between the waning royal power, the aggressive aristocratic domination, and the nascent modern spirit, were those which took place in Béarn, Brittany, Dauphiny, Franche Comté, Languedoc, and Vol. 177.—No. 353.

The provincial nobility of the more remote provinces were especially united in spirit; and amongst them the distinction between the sword and the gown, which was jealously maintained at Versailles, was very much less marked,* while they agreed in a feeling of hostility to the favoured circle of the Court and the despotism of the Ministry. That such sentiments should be felt very strongly at Béarn, was the more natural, since it constituted a larger part of that kingdom which formed a separate part of the Sovereign's title-Louis XVI., like his predecessors since Henry IV., being 'King of France and of Navarre.' In 1788, that province still enjoyed a written constitution, to the maintenance intact of which each successive king had sworn at his accession. Having been unofficially informed of the royal decree establishing the new Provincial Assemblies, the Parlement of Navarre made haste to protest beforehand against any change in the ancient constitution. This done, they quietly awaited the action of the central power. That action soon took place; registration was enforced, and the Parlement was compelled to evacuate the Court of Justice.

Yet the city of Pau remained calm; the bulk of the middle class there, as in Paris, remaining but passive spectators. But the nobility acted energetically, first by exciting in the peasant proprietors fears of arbitrary taxation, and secondly, assembling in great force within the city. They were quickly followed by bands of mountaineers, who seized the guns, broke open the Court of Justice, and loudly demanded the restoration of the Parlement. Thereupon the Syndic entered in state, and brought with him a decree of the nobility of Béarn, declaring infamous whoever should obey the newly registered laws, and asking the King to revoke them. The nobility had no legal right so to meet or to pass any decree. It was a purely revolutionary proceeding.

The King, who passed his days in hunting, and abandoned the task of governing to his Ministers, on condition that he was not called on for uncongenial efforts, recoiled, as usual, from enforcing a command which met with resistance. So it was that the Duc de Guiche, of the house of Grammont, one of the nobility of the Province of Béarn, was despatched on a mission of conciliation. But the nature of his mission was not suspected, and accordingly, when he arrived at Pau on the 13th of July, 1788, he was met by a dense and sullen crowd, from which not one cry of Vive le roi proceeded. Then he at once explained to

Cherest, vol. i. p. 505.

the people that he had told the King he would have no part in any act of rigour, and that his mission was entirely pacific. Thereupon acclamations broke forth as he was escorted to his lodgings, and, in true French fashion, the cradle of Henry IV. was taken from the castle, surrounded with garlands, and borne

to him in triumph.

e

a

e

t

S

e

le

ıt

at

ed

of

d

ıd

al

0-

 \mathbf{d}

as

m

as

he

on

d,

y,

ot

to

he

The next day he attended a meeting of the Parlement, and, in the King's name, surrendered all the points demanded, on the sole condition that a formal pretence of submission should be made. This sole condition was that some persons should be sent to Versailles to ask the King's pardon, while the Parlement should suspend its action till the royal authorization for a convocation of the Provincial Estates was received. But even this concession was refused, and the Duke, after employing in vain the most conciliatory and flattering expressions, was forced to return absolutely unsuccessful. There was nothing left for the Ministry to do but to command the Parlement to come to Ver-The long journey of the magistrates across France was taken only to find Brienne replaced by Necker, and all the local parlements restored to the plenitude of their powers. Thus the aristocracy and peasantry of Béarn gained a complete victory over the King's government.

Meantime analogous events were occurring in Brittany. That province was almost fanatically attached to its ancient institutions, and all classes were, save for a single disputed point, exceptionally united. Fully aware of this, the Government had provided a considerable number of troops. They were, however, worse than useless, owing to the character of the military commander of the province, the Count de Thiard. Devoted to society, and full of sympathy for the errors and even the violence of men of his own class, he detested the work he had to do, and desired to get through it as quickly as possible. Bertrand de Molleville, who was second in command, was more independent of social influences, though he also disliked the

position given to him.

On the 5th of May the Parlement of Brittany met, and protested in advance (like that of Béarn) against any invasion of the ancient provincial customs, invoking the treaty by virtue of which Brittany had passed under the sway of Francis I. That evening leading members of the nobility, headed by their Dean, went to M. Thiard to express their confident hope that the King would withdraw his edict concerning the new Provincial Assemblies. The movement quickly spread, dignified ecclesiastics (such as the Canons of the Chapter of Rennes) joined it, and even such members of the tiers état as were in touch with

the two higher orders. Thus encouraged, the Parlement declared itself en permanence, while the nobility met and passed a decree declaring any one 'infamous' who should accept a post under the new royal ordinances, and the capital of the province became in a state of incipient insurrection. The times had indeed changed: under Louis XV., in 1771, similar decrees were carried out without difficulty. M. de Thiard called out his troops, but not only forbade firing, but ordered them to show the people, with their ramrods, that the muskets were not loaded. Thereupon not a few of them were snatched away from the soldiers' hands and broken.

On May 10th Thiard and De Molleville went to the Parlement, and had the decrees registered, but were insulted on their return home, and then for a time kept prisoners in their quarters. Encouraged by their powerlessness and inactivity, the disorder increased, soldiers were assaulted, and a cari-

cature of a 'bed of justice' was paraded.

The house of the Parlement being meantime occupied by the soldiery, the magistrates met elsewhere, and passed a decree declaring the edicts registered to be void and of no effect. On receiving, however, lettres de cachet ordering them to go into exile, they obeyed; but disorder still continued. These disorders were fomented by the nobility, the middle class generally holding itself aloof. So incensed were the nobles with M. Thiard for even the feeble action he had taken against them, that, on the pretence of his having threatened one of their number with his cane, he and other officers were forced to fight a succession of duels. Evidently they considered that the first duty of an officer (necessarily a noble) was to his class, not to his colours. When the common soldiers, later on, acted against discipline, and sided with their class, they only followed the example which had been set them by their social superiors. The soldiers had been abused by M. de Caradeuc as 'vile satellites of despotism,' little thinking how soon he would wish in vain for such 'satellites' to save his class from the horrors of Jacobinism. At last the central government lost patience, and Thiard was replaced by Maréchal de Stainville—a much more resolute man. Soon the mob learned that this time the muskets were loaded, and would be used against the first tumultuous assemblage. Then order was at once restored. This well shows how true it is that the first thing necessary in dealing with a mob is to show no fear, and the second, to make it evident that authority is firm and determined.

Meantime Léoménie de Brienne fell, and Necker assumed power, with the result that the old Provincial Estates were restored.

restored. Those of Brittany were convoked for the 29th of December. But now a very long standing grievance cropped up; namely, that single disputed point before referred to as marring the harmony between the commons and the two higher orders.

t

n

r

n

-

d

n

h

n

n

s.

e, b

d

h

n.

IS

1.

ì,

e.

e

0

y

1.

Since the year 1541 the Provincial Estates had, without any royal assent, imposed a tax upon the members of the third order, known as 'extraordinary forage.' The proceeds of this charge, borne exclusively by the tiers état, served to defray the general expenses of the province. This injustice had been brought to the notice of the King, who charged his commissaries to demand its repeal in favour of a charge levied on all three orders alike. At this the commons were naturally delighted, but the suggestion was passionately repelled by the The excitement occasioned by this dispute had been so great that a decision was deferred till the next assemblage of the estate—that, namely, which was now about to take place. But the chance of carrying through the reform successfully was small, seeing that the commons were so very sparsely represented in the estates of Brittany. On this account the Municipality of Rennes charged its deputies on no account to take part in any other deliberation till this rectification had been effected, and a demand was made, far and wide, that the number of the deputies of the tiers état should be made equal to that of the clergy and nobles combined, according to the new royal decree about Provincial Assemblies.

In this somewhat critical state of affairs the nobility had the extreme imprudence to hold a preliminary meeting, wherein it was resolved that no precedence should be given to any demand of the commons. At the opening of the Estates, the nobility assembled to the number of 1200 (each with a right to vote), with a crowd of enthusiastic youths belonging to their class. The commons were but 42 in number, but by their dogged determination to persist in an attitude of absolute passivity they frustrated all the efforts of their opponents. Thereupon the Estates were prorogued till February 3rd, but the decree of prorogation was, in its terms, so sympathetic with the commons, that it was received with loud cries of 'Vive le roi!' and the city of Rennes illuminated. But the members of the two privileged orders refused to adjourn, resolving to prolong the sitting night and day till the 3rd of February.

The commons having appealed to Versailles, Necker sent a decree permitting the doubling of the commons, should the clergy and nobility consent thereto. The decree was doubly vain, seeing that even were such consent accorded they would

still be enormously outvoted by the higher orders. But those orders did not confine themselves to refusing consent, they initiated an appeal to force. By their instigation two thousand people, for the most part directly or indirectly their dependants, assembled outside the city, and then marched in procession to the Parlement, where they were gravely received and listened to. So encouraged, and inflamed with drink, they noisily traversed the streets and violently assaulted and seriously wounded a number of students. Then members of the clergy and nobility ran to prevent further outrage, but it was too late to effect more than a momentary pacification. The youths of the middle class sympathized with the students, and planned retaliation, while many of their sires became tired of seeing the privileged orders in continuous session in spite of the prohibition of the King. They attempted to stop the noblesse from going to their hall. The latter then drew their swords, but the students were provided with fire-arms, and two of the nobles fell. The members of the higher orders were then besieged in their place of meeting, which the students threatened to set fire to; and it was only through the intervention of M. Thiard that the clergy and nobles were able to retire in safety. When the 3rd of February approached, the nobility again began to assemble. But a royal decree definitively closing the Estates was read, and such stringent orders were given to M. Thiard that the meeting was effectually dispersed, though not without a display of artillery and a serious threat of its employment.

Thus the imprudence and selfishness of the privileged orders excited revolutionary passions, in what had been a most patient province, and one exceptionally attached to both Church and King. The resistance of these orders in Brittany to all liberal modifications continued to the last. Both clergy and nobility refused to attend the King's summons to elect deputies to the States-General, whereby were lost 31 votes, which might have supported the moderate party. It was a similar abstention in the Province of Artois which led to the election there of Charles de Lamotte and Robespierre.

Dauphiny had preserved its Provincial Estates till 1628, when they were suppressed by Richelieu. In 1787 the Duke of Orleans (afterwards Philippe Egalité) was governor, and wrote to the Prime Minister in support of their restoration with some modifications, but in vain. On May 20th, the hall of the Parlement at Grenoble being occupied by soldiers, the magistrates met at the house of their president, M. de Bérulle, and passed a resolution condemning the Ministerial edicts and all who should act on them. For this they received lettres de cachet exiling

them,

them, and they prepared to depart on the morning of June 7th. But an insurrection broke out, the tocsin sounded; a crowd unloaded the magistrates' carriages, and then rushed towards the house of the Duke of Clermont-Tonnerre, commandant of the province. On their way they encountered some troops, whose commander forbade them to fire on the citizens, with whom the soldiers then fraternized. One officer alone sternly held aloof—it was Bernadotte, the future King of Sweden. The Duke of Clermont-Tonnerre, whose feebleness had allowed the revolt to begin, gained nothing by his weakness. Though defended by 300 men, the insurgents effected an entrance, and forced him, with an axe held over his head, to nullify the letters of exile, and to confide the task of restoring order to M. de Bérulle and his brother magistrates.

A few days later a permanent committee of the nobility, who remained at the head of affairs, invited the dignified clergy, the municipality, and the most distinguished citizens to a consultation, with a view to themselves solemnly convoking the three orders of the Estates of Dauphiny. The meeting took place at the Hôtel de Ville at Grenoble, and refused to dissolve at a summons from a royal officer. The commons for a time held aloof till, at another meeting, one of the nobility, in the name of his order, declared it to be well understood that the Third Estate should have a double number of representatives, and that votes should be taken by counting heads. Then all difficulties

21st of July.

The Assembly met at 8 o'clock at Vizille in the Castle of the ancient Dauphins. There were 50 dignified clergy, 165 nobles, and 400 commons, amongst whom were many parish priests. Dauphiny thus presented a happy contrast to the rest of France in the union between its orders. At the conclusion of this meeting, one of the commons complimented the members of the two higher orders on the loyalty with which, putting aside ancient prejudices, they had by justice maintained the

vanished, and it was resolved to convoke the Estates for the

union of all classes.

Up to the middle of 1788, the Province of Franche Comté had taken no part in these disputes, but after the King's decrees had been forcibly registered at Besançon, a hundred nobles met and sent a letter to the King, asking for a restoration of the Provincial Estates. The petition was rejected, and the newly instituted Assembly insisted on, which was hateful to the nobility, because of the voting by numbers and not by orders, therein commanded. On the fall of Brienne the nobles met again (on the 10th of September), and imprudently swore never to adopt

any form of assembly save that of the ancient 'estates'—the abuses of which were monstrous; and they were energetically supported by the dignified members of the clergy. Thereupon opposition arose on the part of the commons, encouraged by the lower clergy and a few liberal nobles. With Necker's tacit permission the Estates met on November 27th, in the same form as when last assembled in 1666, but the tiers état protested in favour of such a modification of the Provincial Estates as had

been agreed on in Dauphiny.

Meantime appeared the famous decree of the Government, which ordained that in the great States-General of the whole kingdom, the members of the tiers état were to equal in number the representatives of both the first and second orders. Against this the higher orders of Franche Comté protested violently, and the Parlement co-operating, the exemptions and feudal claims of the privileged classes were declared immutable and incapable of diminution by either the King or the States-General. There was but one authority in which they recognized any such power. Strange to say, this authority was the whole population consulted by universal suffrage, for the express purpose of constituting a national organization. Little did they dream that, three days before, such an appeal had been deter-

mined on by the Government itself.

The Province of Languedoc had inherited from preceding ages a very peculiar constitution. Its estates, though consisting of the usual three orders, met in one chamber and voted by counting heads. Its organization had been much admired by Fénelon, and been taken as a model by the Government in decreeing the 'Provincial Assemblies.' Therefore it was that under the influence of the aristocratic reaction, begun in 1781, the nobles began to protest and claim their separate chamber, and voting by 'orders.' This showed how little they really cared for antiquity and tradition, and how willing they were to welcome radical changes, provided such changes favoured their interests. Meetings were held, the King was applied to, and agitation spread over the province, arousing at last the opposition of the commons. Then the disturbance became so great that Necker dissolved the Estates till such time as their constitution should be definitely settled by the States-General of France.

Provence was a part of France which had long been administered in a very singular manner. Before Richelieu it had enjoyed its Provincial Estates, composed of the usual three orders, and these (as in Languedoc) met in a single chamber and voted by counting heads. Nevertheless the members of the

Third Estate formed such an insignificant minority that they were constantly outvoted, and quite powerless. The suppression of the Estates, therefore, caused no regret to the commons, and all the less because they possessed another institution which gave them a great advantage. The latter (which was in full activity in 1788) was called the 'General Assembly of Communities,' and it met every year for some days at Lambesc. The Archbishop of Aix was its president, and there were six official members, but thirty-six were freely chosen by the municipalities; and so the commons enjoyed in it an effective supremacy; it was a very popular body, which kept the taxes low, and saw that they were equitably distributed. Thus, when the Government instituted its new Provincial Assemblies, it was generally expected that the institution would be maintained.

But the privileged orders protested against it, and called for the re-institution of the old aristocratic Estates of Provence as they were in Richelieu's time, when the commons had practically no vote. Their demand, marvellous to say, was granted, and the Estates held their first sitting on December 31, 1787. The first order was composed of the bishops, vicars-general, deans, chapters, and abbots. The noblesse were represented by 128 members, while the tiers état had but 56, almost half of

whom also were really nobles,

1

1

Accustomed as the inhabitants of Provence had been to the equitable administration of their General Assembly of Communities,' the commons loudly demanded the doubling of their representatives, and equality of taxation. The former demand was conceded, but the nobles would not grant the second, further than by consenting to bear a share in the repair of roads, and to pay 4000 livres towards the support of bastard children. The clergy were less generous still, being only willing to agree to half of what the nobles offered. Thereupon the commons began a vigorous opposition to the Estates, appealing to the King. As the privileged orders had demanded the suppression of the popular 'General Assembly,' and the convocation of the antiquated Estates which gave them the advantage, so the commons in turn, profiting by their example, sought, and after many contentions and much violence at last obtained, the restoration of their beloved 'General Assembly,' which gave them, once more, the upper hand.

The brief account here given concerning the alternately revolutionary and reactionary conduct of the privileged orders, may suffice to bring home to our readers the profoundly different character and conduct of the higher classes in England and in France. In our own country, peers and landed gentry enjoyed

no doubt a considerable predominance; but it was one to which their qualities and conduct had largely entitled them. They always worked energetically for and with the people, bore their fair share of taxation, and possessed few privileges, and none which violently outraged the popular sentiment, while above all they formed no caste. In France the noblesse not only, as every one knows, did form a caste, but one almost exclusively distinguished by odious privileges. They watched with avidity the decay and ruin of the royal power, not as an opportunity for founding a truly national and vigorous polity, but as an opportunity whereby they might themselves benefit exclusively, by augmenting their own privileges, and giving a firm and unalterable basis for those feudal claims which the peasantry

throughout France so passionately detested.

They did not hesitate, as we have seen, again and again to stimulate a revolutionary passion and positive revolt, in the supposed interest of their order, and they were even ready to tamper with that military discipline which should have been, from their traditions, above all sacred in their eyes. The pathetic history of the terrible evils they had afterwards to endure, the monstrous injustice of which they became the victims, and the admirable way in which so many men and women of the most refined culture nobly bore in exile the pressure of terrible privations, must not blind our eyes to the faults of the class to which they belonged. Historic equity compels us to bear witness to faults so graphically described by M. Aimé Cherest. But justice being thus satisfied, we may all the more freely accord to their many merits the esteem they deserve; with deep compassion for those sufferings and calamities which constitute one of the greatest tragedies that human history can offer to our sympathetic contemplation.

the property of the second state of the second

ART. IX.—1. Twenty-five Years in the Secret Service. The Recollections of a Spy. By Major Henri Le Caron. Second Edition. London, 1892.

2. Secret Service under Pitt. By W. J. Fitzpatrick, F.S.A.

Second Edition, enlarged. London, 1892.

3. Sixty Years of an Agitator's Life. By George Jacob

Holyoake. 2 vols. London, 1893.

4. The Molly Maguires. The Origin, Growth, and Character of the Organization. By F. P. Dewees. Philadelphia, 1877.

5. Memoirs of Secret Services of John Macky, Esq., during the Reigns of King William, Queen Ann, and King George I.

London, 1733.

- 6. Anarchy and Anarchists. A History of the Red Terror and the Social Revolution in America and Europe. The Chicago Hogmarket Conspiracy and the Detection and Trial of the Conspirators. By Michael J. Schaack, Captain of Police. Chicago, 1889.
- 7. Memoirs of Joseph Fouché, Duke of Otranto, Minister of the General Police of France. By William W. Gibbings. 1892.

8. Souvenirs d'un Préfet de Police. Par L. Andrieux. Paris, 1885.

9. Tableaux de la Révolution Française. Publiés sur les papiers inédits du Département de la Police Secrète de Paris. By Adolphe Schmidt. Leipzig, 1867.

10. Report of the Special Commission, 1888. Printed for Her

Majesty's Stationery Office. London, 1890.

11. The Cronin Trial. Being Extracts from the Evidence, &c. Printed for and published by the Irish Loyal and Patriotic Union, 1890.

'SO long as there are Governments, so long will there be political spies,' might well be the epigrammatic conclusion of a cynical Home Secretary or Minister of the Interior. 'So long as there are attempts to overturn Governments by force, so long will there be political spies,' would, however, be a truer and more reasonable statement of the proposition. In any case it must be admitted that it will be a very long time before either Europe or America will be able altogether to forego the use of secret agents for the discovery of plots against the existing fabric of society. Could there be a stronger proof of this fact than the speech made by the present Home Secretary in regard to the Dynamite prisoners? Mr. Asquith belongs to a party to which, at the present moment, all idea of repression and coercion is most odious,—a party which has almost come to believe

believe that outrage and violence have only to be ticketed 'inspired by political motives' to render them venial if not indeed commendable. Again, Mr. Asquith won his earliest political reputation by defending in the Law Courts men accused of resisting the operations of the police. Yet Mr. Asquith had not been six months at the Home Office before he employed language which clearly showed that he was relying upon information supplied him by secret agents-upon the reports, that is, of political spies. He told the House of Commons, in effect, that he was sure of the guilt of Daly, the dynamiter, from information which he would divulge to no one, but which he had acquired in his official capacity.* Here is a testimony to the value of, and necessity for, political espionage, the importance of which cannot be exaggerated. Unless, too, the Unionist leaders in Belfast are strangely mistaken, Mr. Morley is also at this moment being forced to make use of these 'resources of civilization' in order to understand and possibly take action in regard to the doings of the Ulster Defence Union. We do not blame Mr. Morley any more than we blame Mr. Asquith. was and is the plain duty of both Ministers to act as they have acted and are acting. It is, however, instructive to notice the position which circumstances have forced them to assume.

We propose in the present article to say something about the doings of political spies in England and America—chiefly in modern times. First, however, we will deal shortly with what we may term, for the sake of convenience, 'the ethics of espionage.' A great deal of nonsense has been talked about the wickedness of those who employ political spies. In truth, there is no wickedness either in receiving and paying for the evidence of an informer, or in employing a secret emissary to discover the perpetrators of offences against the welfare of the State. The moral question depends solely on whether criminal acts have been intended or committed. If they have been, then it is just as moral to employ political spies as to use ordinary detectives. When we say this, we have, of course, no intention of excusing or defending all the actions of the Russian police of to-day or of the Austrian police of a generation ago. Much of that action is and was altogether indefensible, and calls for the condemnation of all honest and right feeling men. We no more excuse the use of political spies to prevent men endeavouring to alter by peaceful means the institutions under which they live, than we defend the laws under which the Jews

^{*} It is probable that Mr. Asquith was alluding, among other things, to letters from Daly to Breslin of the Clan-na-Gael, which are preserved among the records of the Home Office. See note, page 244, of Le Caron's Memoirs.

have been driven from their homes. We use the word criminal, too, in no narrow or merely technical sense. What we mean by criminal acts are acts which would be criminal whatever their motive-acts involving force and outrage, and intended to overthrow existing institutions by violence. In the abstract, no doubt, the distinction is sometimes difficult to draw. In practice, however, it is, as a rule, easy to say what political acts ought to be held criminal and what not. The plot to seize Chester Castle was rightly regarded as criminal. The movement to make Ireland a nation by constitutional means, as long as those means remain constitutional, however much it is to be regretted, is not in its nature criminal. To put the matter in plain terms, those who believe in the lawfulness of a Government have a perfect and unquestionable right to make use of detective agencies to maintain that Government in security. But to say this is not to say that there are no limitations to be observed in the use of political spies. Just as in cases of civil crime there are limits to the employment of detectives, so there are limits to the use of political spies. To begin with, in neither case can it ever be right to employ agents-provocateurs or persons who use any of the devices of the agent-provocateur. It is no more right to encourage men who hold treasonable views in the abstract to do treasonable acts in order that they may be the more easily brought to justice, than it is to encourage members of the criminal class to steal or murder in order to make sure of a conviction. Again, no secret agent should be employed whose character makes it likely that, contrary to orders, he may act in such a way as to tempt men to embark upon enterprises in which they would not otherwise have become involved.

The work of political detection then is no more immoral, if properly conducted, than the work of criminal detection. The political spy and the plain-clothes constable are morally exactly on a level. Men like Le Caron only do in a larger theatre and on a grander scale what the detective does when he sits in a low public-house and wins the confidence of the burglar and area-sneak. If one is doing what is hideous, immoral, and revolting, so is the other. In truth, to neither are such epithets appropriate, and the faithful political spy, like the faithful detective, deserves well of the State that employs him. But though we maintain that it is perfectly possible to employ political spies honourably and rightly, and though we believe that those made use of by the English Government of late years have been men who did not overstep their duties, we are well aware how many and how great are the temptations

to which those who employ political spies are exposed. The English Government has rightly never had a regular staff of secret political agents, and has only made use of such instruments for specific and definite purposes. In France, on the other hand, there is a regular political department connected with the Prefecture of Police-a department which, under varying names, survives all changes of government and policy, and all schemes of police re-organization. A special department hungry, like all departments of State, to assert itself, is apt to make work when none is to be found naturally, and to employ police-officers on enterprises which are often actually within the domain of the agent-provocateur. M. Andrieuxsometime Prefect of Police to the Republic-in his singularly frank Memoirs, has incidentally shown us a good deal of the seamy side of political espionage. His general account of the secret agents employed by the French Prefecture of Police sufficiently indicates how near they approach being agentsprovocateurs. The secret agent of the police is, he tells us, to be found in the journalist who makes himself conspicuous by his violence against the Government in the columns of the opposition newspapers; in the orator who at public meetings urges the mob to make an end of capitalist tyranny; and in the well-dressed gentleman who is to be seen at all the Bonapartist anniversaries with a bunch of violets in his button-hole. ubiquitous spy, he declares, even penetrates into the most exclusive salons of the Faubourg St.-Germain, 'with fleurs-de-lis stuck on every available portion of his person.' The secret agent is indeed confined to no one class of life.

'C'est votre cocher, c'est votre valet de chambre, c'est votre maîtresse, ce sera vous demain, pour peu que la vocation vous prenne, à condition toutefois que vos prétentions n'excèdent pas vos mérites, car ceux qui sont à vendre ne valent pas tous la peine d'être achetés.'

M. Andrieux gives us a specific instance of the sort of work that is done by the agent-provocateur. He tells us how an official of importance in the Prefecture of Police, while engaged in managing an election some twenty years ago, thought it would be useful to evoke the red spectre. He accordingly organized a Socialist committee, and provided them with an attractive programme. This included a reform of the laws regulating property in such a way that the sole source of private property should be Labour, 'the immediate and permanent armament of the nation,' and the abolition of standing armies. In regard to this police programme, M. Andrieux playfully remarks that of late years the task of the police has been greatly

greatly simplified. There is no longer any need for any one to trouble his imagination with the invention of Socialist programmes. 'La propagande révolutionnaire dépasse ce qu'elle pouvait rêver.' Strangely enough, M. Andrieux does not seem to have regarded this action as specially reprehensible, or as coming under the head of the employment of agentsprovocateurs, which he strongly condemns. Indeed, he prefaces the story by remarking of the official who concocted the bogus Socialist programme, that he never found in his administration a trace of the employment of agents-provocateurs. Nay, more, though M. Andrieux in his chapter on 'Agents Provocateurs' declares with pride that during his administration he entirely repudiated 'the system of provocation,' he confesses to having been obliged to grant subventions to certain newspapers which acted at one and the same time as the organs of the active revolutionary party, and as 'the mouse-traps'-souricières-of While on the subject of M. Andrieux's bundle of judicious indiscretions-indiscretions which include among other things a detailed and humorous revelation of the secrets of Freemasonry-we may mention some of his shrewd observations in regard to the difficulties which are connected with the employment of a regular staff of professional political spies. There is, to begin with, the probability that the man who takes the pay of the police may also find it convenient to take the pay of the men whom he is set to watch. This renders it necessary to set a second political spy to watch the first without his knowledge, and to take, with regard to the second, the same precautions against betrayal which were taken in the case of the first. No doubt precautions of this kind are sometimes necessary in the case of ordinary detectives, but, in the case of political secret agents, the danger that the spy will secure his position with both parties is far greater. The common criminal has not, as a rule, command of sufficient resources to corrupt the detective. In war the danger of employing a double spy is clearly recognized. The Duke of Wellington, for example, was wont to express his belief that the chief spy from whom he received information, and who passed freely between the two Peninsular armies, was in the pay both of the English and the French generals. A still more amazing story of the difficulties connected with the work of espionage is told in regard to the exiled Bourbon princes during the reign of the First Napoleon. At his master's suggestion one of the suite of Louis XVIII. opened communications with Fouché, and the pay of the supposed spy became a regular source of income to the banished Prince, who gained both profit and amusement by minutely reporting his own doings in England and

We have, however, said enough in regard to the ethics of political espionage. Those who believe in the lawfulness of a particular Government have a perfect moral right to regard violent and illegal attempts to destroy that Government as criminal, and to combat them by the same machinery and under the same conditions that attempts at ordinary civil crime are combated. Cromwell, for example, had a right to support his Government by the use of spies, and to object to his doing so is absurd.

We propose on the present occasion to deal chiefly with political spies in modern times. We may, however, since his name is very little known, mention first an interesting spy of the period of the Revolution of 1688-John Macky, a person whose curious Memoirs were given to the world in 1726. According to an interesting manuscript note written in an old hand, in a copy of the Memoirs preserved in the Library of the Reform Club, Macky was of Scotch descent but born in England. The note in question describes him as 'Supple and discriminative, he was base and venal: outwardly a Jacobite, he attended James into exile, but betrayed the master he pretended to serve: he became William's spy.' Macky's chief services consisted in warning the Government against attempted invasions of England by the French. His methods were in many ways very modern. For instance, he was employed to write a pamphlet entitled 'A View of the Court of St. Germaines,' of which some 32,000 copies were sold, and in which the tyrannical and intolerant spirit of the exiled Royal Family was strongly brought out. A good deal of the detailed spying seems to have been done by 'two women that were permitted to go to Germaines with gloves.' As every good political secret agent should, Macky seems to have possessed a special aptitude for the preparation of dossiers. After the passing of the Act of Settlement had made the Electress Sophia the heir to the English throne, that able and prudent Princess desired to acquaint herself with the personal characteristics, the exact political opinions, and generally the public position and standing of the chief men of the kingdom. Accordingly she applied to Macky for what would be called in France the dossiers of these persons. He supplied her with a racy and, as far as can be judged at this period of time, a fairly accurate record of the principal members of the English and Scottish nobility and of the chief officers commanding by sea and land. These were published by Macky's son, along with other papers,

and they constitute an exceedingly curious and interesting contribution to the historical documents of the Revolution period. As an example of these trenchant little Memoirs, we may quote the following account of Matthew Prior:—

'Matthew Prior, Ex-Commissioner of Trade, was taken from the Bar of a Tavern by my Lord Dorset and sent to the University of Cambridge; was contemporary with Montague Lord Halifax, and joined with him in writing that fine satire against Mr. Dryden called the Hind and the Panther, transferred to the story of the City Mouse and Country Mouse.

'At the Revolution he was brought to Court and sent to Holland as Secretary to my Lord Dursley; and after that Lord's being recalled, was continued Secretary for the English nation to the States

General for some years.

'When my Lord Jersey was made one of the Lords Justices in Ireland he was made Secretary to that Commission, as also to the Treaty of Ryswick, and to the Lords Portland and Jersey, Ambassadors in France, and afterwards one of the Commissioners of Trade. He was chosen a Member of that Parliament which impeached the Partition; to this Treaty he was Secretary, and yet joined in the Vote with those who carried on the Impeachment against those that had established him in the world.

'On the Queen's accession to the throne he was continued in his office, is very well at Court with the Ministry, and is an entire Creature of my Lord Jersey's, whom he supports by his advice. Is one of the best poets in England, but very factious in conversation;

a thin hollow-looked man turned of forty years old.'

No less striking are the dossiers of the Duke of Marlborough and of Robert Harley, who, it is said, 'never fails to have a clergyman of each sort at his Table on Sunday; his family go

generally to the Meeting.'

Throughout the earlier half of the eighteenth century, English Ministers had to employ political spies to combat the machinations of the Jacobites, and when England became involved in the war with the French Republic it again became necessary to have recourse to these means of preserving the State from dissolution. A very striking account of the doings of the political spies and informers made use of in Ireland at the close of the last century, has lately been published by Mr. Fitzgerald. In 'Secret Service under Pitt' Mr. Fitzgerald has followed up the researches of Mr. Lecky and Mr. Froude, and has disclosed the exact means by which the various conspiracies of the years preceding the Act of Union were circumvented and Everything connected with the book is brought to ruin, highly melodramatic. Till within a few years ago there stood in one of the offices in Dublin Castle two iron-clamped chests Vol. 177,-No. 353.

filled with papers relating to the period between 1795 and 1805. These chests bore the Government seal, and on them was the tantalizing inscription, 'Secret and Confidential: not to be opened.' For nearly a century these chests remained unexplored. At last, however, access was obtained to them. At once a hundred betrayals and treacheries leaped to light. Men who had apparently died high-souled patriots were seen to have been Government spies from the beginning and traitors to the cause

they seemed willing to die for.

Though his treachery was not made known by means of the papers in the 'iron-clamped chests,' Samuel Turner, the informer, is one of the most remarkable personages to be encountered in the pages of Mr. Fitzgerald's volume. Turner, a North of Ireland gentleman of good birth, was one of the leaders of the United Irishmen, and held a principal place in the councils of the conspiracy. Yet after a very short period he persistently and regularly betrayed the most secret plans of the organization to the English and Irish Governments. And here it may be as well to point out that Samuel Turner's treacheries were the product not of the 'base and brutal' Union, but took place during the period which we are now asked to believe was the golden age of Irish history—the period of Grattan's Parliament. The greater part, indeed, of the political spying described in Mr. Fitzgerald's book belongs to the rule of an independent Irish Legislature. Samuel Turner's first appearance as an informer is as sensational as anything ever devised by the most blood-curdling playwright of the Adelphi or the Porte Saint-Martin. It has been described with inimitable skill by Mr. Froude. This description, quoted by Mr. Fitzgerald, is as follows :--

One night, early in October 1797, a person came to the house of Lord Downshire in London, and desired to see him immediately. Lord Downshire went into the hall and found a man muffled in a cloak, with a hat slouched over his face, who requested a private interview. The Duke (sic) took him into his library, and when he threw off his disguise recognized in his visitor the son of a gentleman of good fortune in the North of Ireland, with whom he was slightly acquainted. Lord Downshire's "friend" (the title under which he was always subsequently described) had been a member of the Ulster Revolutionary Committee. From his acquaintance with the details of what had taken place it may be inferred that he had accompanied the Northern delegacy to Dublin and had been present at the discussion of the propriety of an immediate insurrection. The cowardice or the prudence of the Dublin faction had disgusted him. He considered now that the conspiracy was likely to fail, or that, if it succeeded, it would take a form which he disapproved; and he had

come

come over to sell his services and his information to Pitt. In telling his story to Lord Downshire he painted his own conduct in colours least discreditable to himself. Like many of his friends, he had at first, he said, wished only for a reform in Parliament and a change in the Constitution. He had since taken many desperate steps and connected himself with desperate men. He had discovered that the object of the Papists was the ruin and destruction of the country, and the establishment of a tyranny worse than that which was complained of by the Reformers; that proscriptions, seizures of property, murders, and assassinations were the certain consequences to be apprehended from their machinations; that he had determined to separate himself from the conspiracy. He was in England to make every discovery in his power, and if Lord Downshire had not been in London, he had meant to address himself to Portland or Pitt. He stipulated only, as usual, that he should never be called on to appear in a court of justice to prosecute any one who might be taken up in consequence of his discoveries. Lord Downshire agreed to his conditions; but, as it was then late, he desired him to return and complete his story in the morning. He said that his life was in danger even in London. He could not venture a second time to Lord Downshire, or run the risk of being observed by his servants. Downshire appointed the empty residence of a friend in the neighbourhood. Thither he went the next day in a hackney-coach. The door was left unlocked, and he entered unseen by any one. Lord Downshire then took down from his lips a list of the principal members of the Executive Committee by whom the whole movement was at that time directed.

From this time forward Samuel Turner regularly betrayed his associates, and though his refusal ever to give evidence in a court of law makes it difficult to trace exactly the effect of his disclosures, it is clear that it was on information supplied by him that the principal rebels were arrested and subsequently hanged. It is not to be wondered that Samuel Turner was 'convinced that he would go to utter destruction' if it were known that he had betrayed the cause. That the arrangements made by the United Irishmen for the despatch of informers were exceedingly effective, no one knew better than Samuel Turner, for he had helped to make them. We know on the sworn information of another informer, Conlan, that it was agreed that whenever an informer was detected, 'he was to be sent to some United Irishman with the password-"Do you know Ormond Steel?"' On hearing these words it was of course the duty of the United Irishman to 'kill at sight.' How well Turner employed his gift for detection may be gathered from the fact that he lived at Hamburg-a place much frequented by the Irish exiles-in Lady Edward Fitzgerald's house as her most trusted friend, 'kept watch over her letterbag, and was admitted to close and secret conversations upon French interference in Ireland with Reinhard, the Minister of the Directory.' During all this time and for many years after his death, indeed up till Mr. Lecky's discovery of the secret, Samuel Turner was unsuspected of the slightest treachery, and died in the full odour of patriotic sanctity. Strangely enough, he may be said to have been regarded as the ideal Irish patriot, for it seems possible, if indeed not probable, that it was his picturesque figure that inspired Campbell's 'Exile of Erin.' As Mr. Fitzgerald suggests, Turner in his cloak and slouched hat, prowling on the beach near Hamburg—the very place where Campbell wrote his verses—is exceedingly likely to have attracted the attention of the poet. But though for the world in general Samuel Turner lived a patriot unstained, his treacheries undiscovered and his reputation untarnished, there are circumstances connected with his death which make it seem likely that some member of the conspiracy found out that he was an informer, and at last acted on the question, 'Do you know Ormond Steel?' A gentleman-Mr. Mathews of Dundalk-who was 'an ardent patriot,' and implicitly believed in Turner as late as 1869, describes Turner's end in a letter to Mr. Fitzgerald. He states that Turner went to the Isle of Man, and, having quarrelled there with a Mr. Boyce, agreed that the dispute should be settled by an appeal to arms. 'Both with their friends repaired to the field of honour, and, as Turner was preparing for the struggle, his adversary shot him through the head, and thus terminated the career of a man whose only regret was that his life was not lost in the service of his country.' Mr. Fitzgerald does not give us the date of Turner's death, but we gather that it must have occurred some time after 1815. Such was Samuel Turner, the informer. Doubtless the man was a corrupt and treacherous villain, but who can say that Pitt was to blame for making use of him to stop a conspiracy which might have been the ruin of both England and Ireland—a conspiracy which would have laid both kingdoms at the feet of the most unprincipled clique of politicians to be found in the world's history, the French Directory?

Mr. Fitzgerald's book contains many other figures as base as that of Turner. Perhaps the vilest and meanest of them all is McNally, the theatrical barrister, who betrayed the secrets of the very prisoners whose defence he had undertaken and who thus prostituted the sacred trust of his calling. A more hideously corrupt scoundrel it is difficult to conceive. McNally, however, was personally a brave man and a noted duellist. Besides

being

being a spy, he was a journalist of considerable ability, and the author of an exceedingly successful opera, 'Robin Hood.' We cannot, however, deal with all the spies in Mr. Fitzgerald's book, and must therefore leave the details of McNally's career untouched. But before we close our notice of 'Secret Service under Pitt' we will say something in regard to Armstrong, the volunteer spy, whose evidence hanged the Sheareses. Armstrong was an officer in the Militia, who acted a part very similar to that lately played by Major Le Caron-a part which Mr. Fitzgerald condemns, but which appears to us, on his statement of the evidence, to have been both patriotic and consistent with honour. Circumstances put Armstrong in touch with a dangerous conspiracy, and afforded him an opportunity for discovering and circumventing it, provided that he would pretend to sympathize with the popular cause. He laid the matter before his Colonel and brother officers, and they encouraged him to continue his investigations. The story of his work as a spy may be given in Mr. Fitzgerald's own words :-

'Captain John Warneford Armstrong, the descendant of a Scotch settler in Ireland, was at heart a supporter of oligarchical principles, but acted so well the part of a flaming patriot, that Byrne, a democratic bookseller, led Armstrong to his private room and presented him to Sheares as "a true brother on whom you may implicitly depend." Henry declined to hold converse unless in the presence of his brother John. Armstrong said he would wait until John came. Conversation, however, had commenced before his arrival; he at length appeared with Byrne, and the latter introduced Armstrong in an equally impressive way. Armstrong deposed on the trial that John Sheares said, "I know your principles very well," and asked him to join the cause by action as he had already done by inclination. Armstrong replied, "I am ready to do everything in my power for it, and if you can show me how I can assist I will serve you to the utmost." John, an impulsive youth, said that the best way he could help was to gain over the soldiery, and confer with him as to the best way of seizing the royal camp. Armstrong appointed to meet him at Bagot Street with this end; he did so, and on Sunday night, May 13, paid another visit, both brothers being present. On the 15th he called twice; John Sheares said he would like to introduce him to a friend of his, Surgeon (afterwards General) Lawless, with whom he might consult and advise in his absence—he (John) being obliged to go down and organize Cork. All this time Henry Sheares is found reticent, and at some of the interviews he was not present at all. However, on Thursday, the 17th, both brothers appeared to this apparently zealous convert to their cause; Lawless was also by, and (according to Armstrong's testimony) said: "He had lately attended a meeting of deputies from almost all the militia regiments, at which meeting there were two of his [the approver's] men. 'Henry 'Henry Sheares, now familiar with Armstrong as his guest and constant visitor, let fall some remarks by which the betrayer succeeded in implicating him as having knowledge of the military organization. This was not enough for Armstrong; that evening he returned to their house. Henry did not appear. John came down and obtained a written introduction from him to a sergeant in his regiment, known to be a United Irishman. The most sickening part of this story has yet to be told. Armstrong continued to worm himself into the hearts of his victims. He accepted their invitations to dinner, mingled with their family, listened to Mrs. Sheares singing at the harp for his entertainment, and, as Curran declared, fondled on his knee the child of the man whom he had marked for doom.'

The subsequent career of Armstrong is characteristic of the country in which he lived. Though he was universally hated and denounced as an informer, he lived for sixty years in a part of Ireland honeycombed by secret societies, drawing during all that time a pension of 500l. from the Castle—a pension granted for his services as a political spy. It is alleged, indeed, that he became extremely popular among the peasantry of the district in which he lived, and that at his funeral in 1858 'well-known Ribbonmen,' who were present, were seen to weep at the thought of their dead friend. This fact, however, and the circumstance that Armstrong's life was never attempted, are accounted for in a very curious way. When giving leases, 'or using his influence with higher lords of the soil for that end, he cunningly got his own life inserted as a beneficial interest to the tenants.' Hence the murder of Armstrong would have inflicted a heavy fine on the whole country-side. No wonder that a thrifty peasantry 'hesitated to shoot,' and that Armstrong, to use Mr. Fitzgerald's words, 'in the hotbed of Ribbonism gloried to the end in a sort of charmed life.'

The story of Armstrong at once suggests a comparison with that of another and more celebrated secret agent and spy—Major Le Caron. But though we do not think it can be established that Armstrong acted in a way which makes him deserve the condemnation of honest and right feeling men, we are of opinion that Major Le Caron's conduct is still clearer from blame. If prejudice and unreasoning sentiment are laid aside and the facts carefully examined, we believe that it will be agreed that Major Le Caron performed the difficult and dangerous work of a political spy not only loyally and faithfully, but without recourse to any action that can fairly be regarded as in any true sense immoral. He is an instance of a political detective who did necessary and patriotic work not only without fear, but without reproach. Neither he nor those who employed

him

him have the smallest possible reason to be ashamed of what they did. There are three tests by which the work of a political spy can be judged. First, we must ask, 'Did he act in any sense as an agent-provocateur, or betray into criminal courses men who would otherwise have remained innocent?' Secondly, 'Was his purpose honest?—that is, was his purpose detective from the beginning, and not a criminal one become uncriminal merely through fear or through the desire for money? Thirdly, 'Did he in giving evidence in Court speak "the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth," and refuse to improve his evidence either by a suppression of truth or a suggestion of falsehood?' Tried by these tests, we believe that Major Le Caron must be pronounced to have acted his part of political detective honourably and fairly. In regard to the first point, it is to be noted that though the men against whom his evidence at the sittings of the Special Commission was directed were naturally exceedingly anxious to prove him an agentprovocateur, and though we cannot doubt that they had access to the evidence of plenty of men with whom Le Caron had been connected in his work among the Secret Societies, no attempt was made to show that he had ever manufactured criminals for the purpose of betraying them. We see no sort of reason to doubt that what Le Caron says, both in regard to this and to the accusation that he was an informer-a man who deserts a cause in which he believes for money-is true. In his book Twenty-five Years in the Secret Service,' he uses these words: 'I have in no sense been an informer as the phrase is understood. I allied myself with Fenianism in order to defeat it; I never turned from feelings of greed or gain on the men with whom I at first worked in sympathy. I never had any sympathy with Irish Revolutionists. Quite the opposite. Nor have I been an agent-provocateur. Although I always voted, for politic reasons, on the side of the majority, even to joining in the vote which meant dynamite, on no single occasion was I instrumental in bringing an individual to the commission of crime.

In this context may also be mentioned Major Le Caron's defence of himself for taking the Fenian oaths. By taking them, he declares, he saved many lives. 'And,' he goes on, 'who is it that sneers at me for my conduct in this regard? An honest man's criticism I can accept; but for the judgment of those double-oathed gentlemen who, having first taken the Fenian oath, then rushed to Westminster to swear allegiance to the Crown and Constitution they had aforetime sworn to destroy, I have nothing but contempt and derision.'

This

This apology for breaking the rebel oaths appears to us sound. Granted, as we think all reasonable men will grant, that it was necessary to discover the plans of the Irish Secret Societies, it is absurd to say either that Major Le Caron had no right to take the oaths or that because he took them his testimony is not to be believed. If the deceptions of the detective are allowable, which we presume only a fanatic would deny, those deceptions cannot stop at acting lies. To take a melodramatic and blood-curdling oath is no more immoral than to encourage people to believe you are a commercial traveller when in truth you are a plain-clothes constable. Major Le Caron was in effect a military spy; and while we maintain an Army Intelligence Department, and allow the able men who control it to avail themselves of 'confidential reports,' it would be the height of hypocrisy to look askance upon the secret agent who saved Canada from the second Fenian raid. As to Le Caron's credibility, we need not do more than state the fact that the Judges in the Special Commission, in spite of their earnest wish not to rely in the report upon any evidence that could in the least degree be regarded as untrustworthy or suspicious, adopted the testimony of the political detective as worthy of credit. Again, the ablest of modern advocates entirely failed to break down Le Caron in cross-examination, and was obliged to leave the witness without in any way shaking the effect of his testimony.

In his Memoirs Le Caron has given us a very interesting and straightforward account of how he became a spy and of the nature of the work he had to undertake. In the American Civil War, Le Caron-whose real name, it will be remembered, was Thomas Beach, but who had adopted the French patronymic while residing in Paris-served first as a private, and then as an officer. During the latter part of his service he was engaged in the difficult and dangerous work of helping to clear Tennessee of the bands of semi-marauders and irregular rebel troops which infested the South-Western States during the closing period of the war. Here Lieutenant Le Caron engaged in many perilous adventures. One of these is worth relating. It happened that Le Caron, with a band of some thirty troopers, found himself one evening near a farmhouse some fifteen miles from Nashville. Here he resolved to rest his party for the night. While supper was preparing the soldiers and the inhabitants of the farm passed the time in pleasant talk. On a sudden, however, all was confusion. The house was found to be surrounded by a body of marauders calling themselves irregular Confederate cavalry. Half Le Caron's band were with the horses and so

managed

managed to escape, but he and those with him in the house were captured, and soon imprisoned in a shed while the enemy ate the supper which had been prepared for the wearers of the The position was not a pleasant one. dark blue uniform. The Southern marauders got no quarter at the hands of the Union soldiers, and it was therefore certain that they would give none. While the prisoners thus waited with the thought of death in their minds, they noticed that the sounds of merriment had died out in the house, and then to their astonishment that even the tramp of the guard at the door had ceased. Soon after these sounds had completely stopped they heard the bolt of the shed withdrawn by some unknown hand, and opening the door the prisoners found the way clear for escape. One of the nieces of the farmer, finding that the gang of irregulars had all betaken themselves to sleep, had decoyed away the sentry on the pretence of getting him supper, and had then returned and unfastened the door, 'prepared to face the consequences when the sleeping ruffians Though it seems almost too complete a piece of melodrama for real life, Major Le Caron returned to marry the brave girl who had saved his life. He could not have done better, in view of his subsequent career, than to marry a wife whose courage was so high and whose nerves so steady. What Major Le Caron owed in later life to the woman who saved him from the hands of the rebels is best told in his own words:—

'Little thought either of us then what the future years held in store. Yet when these years came, and with them the anxious moments, the uncertain intervals, and the perilous hours, none was more brave, more sympathetic, than she. Carrying the secret of my life close locked up in that courageous heart of hers, helping me when need be, silent when nought could be done, she proved as faithful an ally and as perfect a foil as ever man placed like me could have been given by Heaven. A look, a gasp, a frightened movement, an uncertain turn, might have betrayed me, and all would have been lost; a jealous action, a curious impulse, and she might have wrecked my life; a letter misplaced, a drawer left open, a communication miscarried, and my end was certain. But those things were not to be. Brave, affectionate, and fearless, frequently beseeching me to end this terrible career, in which each moment of the coming hours was charged with danger, if not death, she tended her family lovingly, and faced the world with a countenance which gave no sign, but with a caution which never slumbered.'

The details of the steps by which Le Caron became a spy are too well known to be repeated here. We may, however, remind our readers how he discovered that an Irish Fenian movement was taking place among the disbanded soldiers of the Union with intent to injure England, how he mentioned

the fact in letters to his father, how his father communicated the letters to a Member of Parliament and the Member of Parliament to the Home Secretary, and how in the end Le Caron was definitely employed to penetrate the secrets of the conspirators and denounce them to the authorities at home. Le Caron's most important service consisted in giving information of the intended Fenian raid on Canada. Acting on the instructions of the English authorities, he had obtained a position of confidence among the Fenians, and was trusted by them with a knowledge of all the details of the expedition. It is not too much to say that but for Le Caron's disclosures the second raid might have had the most serious consequences. If the 12,000 armed men enrolled for the raid had once burst into Canada, it would have required a great expenditure of blood and treasure to dislodge them, apart from the possibility of a rupture with the United States. It must have indeed been a thrilling moment for Le Caron when he stood on the brow of a little hill and watched the motley crew of volunteers, some in Fenian uniforms of 'green and grey faced with gold,' and some in everyday dress, cross the American border and enter Canadian territory. When they had passed the wooden bridge over the boundary stream, the spy who was watching from the enemy's head-quarters saw the Fenian army deploy 'as skirmishers in close order' and advance with fixed bayonets, 'cheering wildly.' Not a soul appeared in front, and believing that the raid was a complete surprise, the enthusiasm of the soldiers of the Irish Republic was redoubled. But though the men who were advancing had no notion of the fact, Le Caron was well aware that the woods which skirted the gentle slope of greensward on which the Irish had deployed were filled with Canadian sharpshooters, determined to give a reception to the raiders which they would never forget. Suddenly these wooded solitudes, as the Irish believed, began to echo with the rattle of a deadly volley which was poured into the very midst of the invaders. Utterly taken aback, they stopped, broke rank, and fled, as in 1866, an ungovernable mob, to return for a moment in order to pour a volley on their almost invisible enemy, and to finally retreat uphill to where I stood, still under the fire of their adversaries, leaving their dead to be subsequently buried by the Then occurred an incident which added that touch of the ludicrous which is seldom wanting in Irish revolutions. After the defeat, Le Caron hurried to another point of the frontier, where the contingent with which he was specially connected had its head-quarters. While there, and standing in the road, he was almost knocked down by a carriage which was being

being driven at a furious pace. 'As this conveyance passed by me,' says Le Caron, 'I caught through the carriage window a hurried glimpse of the dejected face of O'Neill [the General in command of the Fenians], who was seated between two men.' It appeared that immediately after the repulse of the Fenians, General Foster, acting as a United States' Marshal, had arrived on the field of battle and had arrested 'General' O'Neill for a breach of the neutrality laws. With this incident ended the Fenian raid. Le Caron's duties, however, were not over, and he continued to watch the Irish secret societies on behalf of the

English Government.

Though often in imminent danger of discovery, Le Caron's luck and skill always preserved him from injury. Probably the most perilous pieces of work undertaken by him consisted in obtaining the originals of important documents. Le Caron, as Senior Guardian of his camp in the Clan-na-Gael, had free access to all the documents, but a stringent regulation of 'the Executive' obliged that all papers not returned to head-quarters should be burned 'in view of the camp.' The documents which must be sent back the political detective could of course only copy, but in the case of those which had to be destroyed in view of the camp he was able to obtain what he wanted. By 'a sleight-of-hand performance' he on several occasions managed to substitute old and unimportant documents for those which should have been burnt, and thus was enabled to send the originals to England. 'I was, of course,' he adds, 'shaking hands with danger and discovery at every turn, and yet so marvellous was my success that I not only escaped betrayal, but that which would undoubtedly have led to it,-namely, suspicion.' completeness with which Le Caron obtained the confidence of his associates was most curious. The strong box of the camp had two locks, with two different keys. One was kept by the Senior, the other by the Junior Guardian. The Junior Guardians, however, often left their keys in the possession of the Senior Guardian, and Major Le Caron tells us that when he was standing in the witness-box of the Special Commission he had both keys of the strong box of his camp in his possession—for at that moment he was still Senior Guardian of Camp 463. It is not necessary to deal with Le Caron's famous interview with Mr. Parnell, or with his account of how he nursed Mr. Davitt and got from his 'patient and guest' some very useful information.

Before leaving Le Caron's book we must notice his warning that the British Government is not paying sufficient attention to its secret service. He points out that Gallaher the dynamiter had 1400l. on him when he was arrested, and that Moroney, the

man connected with the second stage of the Jubilee plot, had 1200l. How on earth, he asks, are the thirty men 'charged with the special duty of circumventing political crime in London' to grapple with 'such heavily financed plots' on the 'miserable sums granted by Parliament for the purpose?'

'Some day, however, a big thing will happen, about which there will be no leakage beforehand, and then the affrighted and indignant British citizen will turn on his faithful band of thirty and rant and rave at them for their want of capacity and performance. The fault will be the want of a perfect system of secret service, properly financed. If plots are to be discovered in time—and already there are some whisperings of coming danger—they can only be discovered through information coming from those associated with them. As I have shown, the men engaged in them are very highly paid. to be made worth their while to speak, then the price offered by the British Government must be higher than that of the other pay-There is no use in thinking that mere tools like Callan and Harkins—the men now in prison in connexion with the Jubilee Explosion Plot-would be of any service. These men know nothing. It is the Millens and Moroneys of the conspiracy who should be in Government pay, and they have no mean price. Imagine offering either of these men a retainer of 201. a month, with a very odd cheque for expenses thrown in! The idea is ridiculous. I have heard it urged that the thought of secret service is repugnant to the British heart, wherein are instilled the purest principles of freedom. The argument has sounded strange in my ears when I remembered that London, as somebody has said, is the cesspool of Europe, the shelter of the worst ruffians of every country and clime. America is called the Land of the Free, but she could give England points in the working of the secret service, for there there is no stinting of men or money.'

It is a curious fact that another of the cleverest and most successful pieces of political detection of modern times should have taken place on American soil, and should have been carried out by an American citizen; for the discovery and bringing to justice of the leaders of the Molly Maguire Conspiracy has every right to be regarded as an act of political secret service. The line between ordinary and political crime is notoriously difficult to draw, but we can hardly be wrong in reckoning a conspiracy to overthrow law and order in a large district, and to substitute the rule of the lawless tribunals of a secret society, as of importance enough to be considered a political movement. The crimes of the Molly Maguires were both really and technically crimes against the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and the legal proceedings to which they gave rise would rightly be included in a collection

of State Trials. It is true that the able 'political spy' who brought the Molly Maguires to justice was engaged by private persons and not by the State, but that circumstance is immaterial. No one can read the record of the doings of McParlan, otherwise McKenna, without admitting that he deserves to rank among those who have served their country by secret service.

n

ie

re

d

lt

e

d

I

is

e

n

0

n

g

re

10

q.

d

10

is

10

n

d

n

d

ıl

e

er

S

e

e

n

From the close of the war till 1875, a secret society of Irish labourers established a veritable reign of terror in the anthracite coal regions of Pennsylvania. They murdered, they intimidated, they bore false witness, they committed every sort of crime and outrage, and with such perfect impunity, that at last life in the district of their operations was led under the conditions which existed in Clare or Kerry during the worst times of the Land An unfriendly attitude towards the 'Mollies,' the suspicion of being an informer, race feeling, and even private hate, were enough to put a man under the ban of the secret society.' After denunciation and the threatening letter which seems inseparable from Irish crime, followed the murder that not only 'must not be denounced,' but must be treated as if it had never occurred. Victims to 'Molly' plots fell in broad daylight and with plenty of bystanders, of whom however not one could be induced to say that he had seen or heard anything, or to identify men whom it was morally certain were perfectly well known to those who refused to give evidence. It was the horrible etiquette of the district to have no eyes or ears for murder, and a case is reported in which a body of miners went on quietly eating their dinners while a few yards from them a fellow-creature was being done to death. 'Sure and wasn't he warned,' was the callous apology offered for the cruellest outrage. If a man who had received an intimation from the 'Mollies' that he must desist under pain of death from a particular course, however lawful and innocent per se, did not desist, he had no one but himself to thank if his house were entered and his brains scattered by the pistol of an assassin. When this state of things had become utterly unbearable, the chief shareholder of one of the great coal companies determined to do his best to put down the secret combination which, it was suspected, must be the cause of the gradual dissolution of the ties of civilized society that was taking place in the anthracite coal Application was accordingly made to Pinkerton's Detective Agency, and a young Irish detective, James McParlan, was set to work to find out the plot. The undertaking seemed absolutely hopeless. To begin with, there was no certainty that any secret society existed. That one was in operation was merely a working hypothesis devised to explain

the murders. But even granted the society, it was extremely difficult to see how a detective could worm himself into the secrets of an organization to which he had absolutely no clue. Yet McParlan did all this; and in a few months from setting to work had not only discovered the existence of a secret society, but had become one of its most prominent members.

The marvellous story of James McParlan's doings, while acting as the spy McKenna, compiled from his evidence at the trials of the 'Molly Maguires,' is told in the book the title of which stands fourth among those at the head of this article. When McKenna, as we shall henceforth call him, arrived in the coal region in December 1873, all he knew was that during the ten previous years some seventy or eighty murders. and scores of minor outrages and acts of intimidation, had been perpetrated without any convictions, and that among the Irish section of the miners killing a man with a pistol had come to be looked on as about equivalent to that physical manner of expressing dislike described among English rowdies as 'punching his head.' It was, however, known that there existed a secret benefit society of the nature of the Oddfellows, Druids, or Shepherds, called the 'Ancient Order of Hibernians,' and it was deemed probable that there was connected with this harmless body-regularly chartered by the Pennsylvanian Legislature—a criminal organization of wide-stretching power and influence. This surmise proved correct. It was the old story of Irish crime. There was an open and constitutional movement, and there was connected with it a secret and criminal movement. Just as the National League had its Fenian and Invincible wings, so the 'Ancient Order of Hibernians' of Pennsylvania had an offshoot in the secret association of the 'Molly Maguires.'

McKenna began his operations in true Irish fashion, by loafing in a low bar kept by an Irishman named Pat Dormer, in one of the townships of the disturbed district. Here he won the confidence of the host and his customers by being able to 'sing a good song, dance a jig, and pass a rough joke.' He flirted with the girls, drank whisky with the men, treated ad libitum, and, best of all, was always ready for a row or shindy of any sort. He followed, in fact, ex-Corporal Mulvaney's maxim, 'Hit a man and help a woman, and you can't be far wrong any way,' and soon gained the esteem of his fellow-countrymen as a roistering blackguard. While engaged in the apparently congenial occupations of loafing, drinking, and fighting, the acute detective noticed that his boon companions, when they grew careless, used a toast the meaning of which he could not make out.

After

After hearing it given several times, he learned the exact words. Next he watched till the landlord was alone, and then asked him to drink. Leaning mysteriously across the counter, he clinked glasses, and in a knowing manner repeated the mystic words of the toast.

'What! are you one of them things?' said the surprised bartender.

'That's what they call me,' replied McKenna.

Pat Dormer without further enquiry treated McKenna as one of the initiated, and accepted the story that McKenna had been a member of the 'Ancient Order of Hibernians' in Buffalo, but had been obliged to leave in a hurry and without communicating with the officers of the society, because of a crime he had committed. The natural sympathy of the Irishman for a runaway was aroused, and Pat Dormer promised that he would manage McKenna's reinstatement in the Order. spy's path was not, however, so easy as it looked at first sight. He had professed membership of an Order of which he knew absolutely nothing but the name, and he had only to be asked to give the 'grip' or the password to be exposed. This was what actually happened. Michael Cooney, who was to have reinstated McKenna, asked awkward questions, and when the spy failed to answer them became indignant. McKenna took the only possible course. He brazened the matter out, called loudly for drinks all round, took a specially generous draught himself, and fell on the floor, feigning to be in a drunken sleep. Cooney thereupon proposed to make an end of McKenna by kicking him on the head. The toleration of the 'bar' for a drunken man, however, prevailed, and it was argued that when McKenna got sober he would be able to explain everything. Cooney was, however, not to be persuaded so easily. 'I don't believe it,' he remarked, 'and I wouldn't believe him unless he brought a card from his body-master.' An ordinary man on hearing these words would have given himself up for lost. McKenna as he lay on the ground felt no such fears. The ruling passion of the detective, strong even in such peril, made him think with pleasure that he had gained from the incident two important items of information—one that cards were issued, and the other that the officer issuing them was called the 'bodymaster'-an appellation no less sinister than the work which he was often called on to perform.

Strange as it may seem, Cooney did not follow up or act on his suspicions, and in the course of a few weeks McKenna had regularly established himself in the 'Ancient Order of Hibernians.' He had now only to conquer the inner ring and to become a 'Molly.' McKenna well knew how to qualify himself for this position. By his violent and reckless talk, and by the dark hints he threw out as to the crimes he had previously committed, he gave an impression that he had an 'utter disregard of all laws, human and divine.' This reputation soon won him first the reverent admiration and respect, and then the confidence, of the men with whom he associated. 'The greater the criminal the better the Molly,' was a cardinal principle in the coal regions, and it would have seemed a thousand pities if the organization had not availed itself of the talents of so hardened and unscrupulous a desperado as McKenna appeared to be. We need not trace the steps by which the spy became a leading 'Molly.' We may, however, mention that he was able to prove in a Court of Justice that he had never asked a man to join the Order, and that he had never by word or deed suggested or encouraged a crime. His constant practice was to communicate to his employers all schemes of murder in order that the intended victims might be protected. Thus, though he was ever ready to pretend sympathy with the perpetrators of a crime after it had taken place, he had always previously done his best to prevent its commission or else had been ignorant beforehand that any criminal act was contemplated. The Order was not highly centralized. Each band of 'Mollies' murdered and intimidated on its own account, and merely expected general help and support from its fellows. It should be mentioned, however, that this duty of mutual help led to the establishment of a sort of murder-exchange. If in two districts the 'Mollies' had determined on murder, men from district A would be draughted into district B, and vice versa, to commit the crime. In this way all risk of identification was avoided. It is needless to point out how strong a proof this fact affords of the hardened callousness of the 'Molly Maguires.' The men who did the killing had seldom the faintest grudge against their victims, but simply acted in obedience to a requisition, or else undertook the work in order that when they themselves wanted a murder committed they should have a claim for help on a neighbouring branch of the Order. It should be noted that this plan of 'swapping' murderers was probably practised in Ireland during the agrarian terror of ten years ago. Before passing from the organization of the 'Mollies,' with their quarrelling toasts,' their 'night passwords,' their 'signs,' and 'questions and answers,' to the further doings of McKenna, we may mention some of the grounds for committing murder. To begin with may be noticed complaints against bosses and superintendents at collieries who had refused work

to members of the Order, and who had given preference to men who were not Irish.' Taking possession of a house belonging to a colliery, but occupied by a member of the organization or by a friend of a member-land-grabbing, in other words-was another serious offence, as was also the obeying of any orders issued by the coal-owners which might happen to be opposed to the rules of the Order. In addition to these murders with a social object were numerous crimes actuated by the desire of revenge, by personal dislike, by pure wantonness, or even by the desire of gain, i.e. mere highway robbery. Such crimes were not officially ordered by the organization, but if committed by a 'Molly' were endorsed as it were by the Order, and the criminal might confidently count upon its members doing everything in their power to support him. Strangely enough, as has repeatedly happened in Ireland, the men who actually fired the shots were often amiable and pleasant-mannered youths. That is, they were often lads leading apparently decent and respectable lives, and, according to their own notions, truly religious. Again, as was the case among the Dublin 'Invincibles,' many of the 'Mollies' were strong teetotalers. A perverted moral sense made it seem to these deluded men a sacred duty to do anything required by the Order. The mandate once issued, the foulest murder became a righteous act, and ordinary commonplace Irishmen turned into fiends who gloried in bloodshed and positively revelled in the hideous details of slaughter. Several of the murderers, for example, declared that 'the pleasure of a murder was almost gone if the victim did not, as they termed it, "squeal."

We cannot follow McKenna through all the intricacies of the plots it was his duty to unravel and countermine-a duty so anxious and terrible that, it is stated, no one who knew McKenna previous to his appearance in the coal region would have recognized him after he had been there a few months. 'All the hair fell off his head; he lost his eyebrows, and his eyesight became impaired.' Yet he stuck to his task and brought it to a successful issue. After he had saved many men's lives by timely information, had made a great deal of love to the sister-in-law of a prominent 'Molly,' and had swallowed oceans of bad whisky, McKenna began to be suspected. A man less brave and self-confident would have fled at once, McKenna, however, believed that he could break down the opposition of the men who suspected him, and he accordingly endeavoured to brazen it out. But while he was counting on being able to allay suspicion with bluster, his death was resolved on. A man named Kehoe suspected McKenna so strongly that he called together a certain number of 'Mollies,' and told

Vol. 177 .- No. 353.

told them that the spy must be killed without waiting for the meeting of the Convention which McKenna had boldly demanded should assemble to sift his case. 'For God's sake,' said Kehoe, 'have him killed to-night, or he will hang half the people in Schuykill County." This proposal was agreed to, and it was resolved that a body of men armed with axes and sledge-hammers should meet McKenna as he came from the train, and should despatch him forthwith. When McKenna got out of the train at Shenandoahthe place where the Convention was to meet on the following day-he expected to find a body of friendly 'Mollies' at the station who would give him news as to how things were going on. Instead he was met by no one. In spite, however, of so ominous an occurrence, he determined to go on. Going into a 'Molly' saloon, he called for porter. The bar-tender, he noticed, was put into a tremor of alarm at this simple request, could hardly draw the cork, and turned deadly pale. Passing up the street, the spy encountered two 'Mollies,' and their strange conduct made it more evident than ever that there was imminent danger threatening McKenna. He did not, however, dare to notice the change in his friends, and walked on to the house of a man named McAndrew, whom he believed to be still friendly.

'When they arrived at McAndrew's house, McKenna, making a strong effort, endeavoured to act as if he were certain of a cordial reception. But the effort was in vain. The conversation was constrained. There was something in contemplation which was concealed from him. Two men were standing outside the house without apparent purpose; one was within, restless and disturbed, as if waiting for some signal. McAndrew appeared nervous, uneasy, undecided. Sweeny got up and said he was going away; to this McAndrew did not respond.

'Sweeny then left, but presently returned with a piece of snow in his hand, which he threw at McAndrew's foot. It was evidently intended to call McAndrew's attention to the fact that time was passing and that nothing was being done. McAndrew hesitated, looked for a moment at McKenna, and then said, "My feet are sore;

I believe I will take off my boots."

'This was intended, and understood, to mean that the scheme which had been adopted to inveigle McKenna into a crowd of men, by whom he was to be beaten and hacked in pieces, was, by McAndrew at

least, that night abandoned. Sweeny then left.

'McKenna, concealing his suspicions, asked McAndrew in a careless way what arrangements had been made about the meeting, and received the answer that the hall had been rented, and that everything was right.

'But he was no longer in doubt. He knew his death was deter-

mined

mined upon, and that at any instant the attack might be made. Still, there was much at stake; he had confidence in his own power; if he could only get a hearing, he was satisfied he could disarm suspicion and retrieve his popularity; but in the meantime he had to save himself from present danger. When he left McAndrew's, instead of taking his usual route to his boarding-house, he passed to the back of the house into a swamp, through which he made his way, and in this manner succeeded in reaching home undiscovered.

'During the following hours he had no sleep. He knew the character of his "Molly" associates, and their modes of action. He knew Jack Kehoe. He knew the ease with which he could be dragged from his bed and murdered; and with a full determination, in the event of an attack, to make his life cost them dear, he sat up all

night, waiting anxiously for the first gleam of dawn.'

In the morning McKenna saw McAndrew and some of the leading men, but there was no sign of a Convention. eleven o'clock two 'Mollies' from a distance came in, one named Doulan, the other Doyle. Both looked as if they had been up all night, and their explanation that they had just arrived by the 'cars' made things more suspicious, for McKenna knew that no trains arrived at Shenandoah at that time of the morning. McKenna at once realized that these men had been chosen to 'remove' him. His next move was a bold one. He announced that he was going to hire a sleigh and drive to the house of Kehoe, whom he now knew had denounced him, to ask why there was no meeting. Accordingly he hired a sleigh, and asked McAndrew, who had saved him the night before, to join him. McAndrew agreed. One of the 'Molly' chiefs, named Monaghan, on this said he would hire another sleigh and come too, and took with him Doulan, one of the two selected assassins, Doyle being already too drunk for active work. While McKenna was taking this strange and terrible 'sleigh ride,' McAndrew confessed to the plot. 'See here,' he said, 'you had better look out for Doulan, the man in the sleigh with Monaghan: he calculates to take your McAndrew further asserted that he still believed in his companion, and that at any rate he thought he ought to have a fair trial.

'McKenna's determination never faltered; he said, "I do not care

a cent, I am going to Kehoe's."

^{&#}x27;On their way McAndrew told of Jack Kehoe's visit to Shenandoah the day before, and the agreement then made to kill him. He told of the party in wait for him, armed with axes, tomahawks, and sledges. He was to be inveigled among them and assassinated. McAndrew said, "I saved your life last night. You were in queer company then, and you will find you are in queer company now."

It is not easy to imagine Kehoe's feelings when this curious sledging party, composed of the would-be murderers, their victim, and a man who can best be described as the confidant both of the victim and the murderers, drew up at his door. Kehoe had every reason to believe that McKenna had been removed on the previous night by the judicious use of hammers and axes. What then must have been his astonishment when he saw the man who ought to have been dead for twenty-four hours drive up with all that air of theatrical merriment and good fellowship which is imparted by jingling sledge bells and the 'crunch' of the runners on the frozen snow, and apparently on the best possible terms with the persons told off to assassinate him? Had Kehoe been read in Scandinavian literature, the words of the Edda would have come back to him, and he might have asked, like Sigrun, 'Can dead men ride?' As it was, he could only look the quotation. McKenna at once indignantly asked why the trial had been put off. Kehoe answered that they were satisfied there was no use trying him, and further added that if he would go to Father O'Conner, a Roman Catholic priest, 'he would find it all out.' True to his plan of brazening it out, McKenna at once declared that he was going to Father O'Conner's. Kehoe's house, however, was full of 'Mollies,' and it was decided that the work in hand should no longer be delayed, and that McKenna should be despatched without further argument. The plan was to take him into a back room and kill him. His body was to remain there until night, and was then to be carried away and thrown down an old coal-pit. McKenna was believed to have no relatives, and it was thought that the murder would attract no attention. McKenna soon realized how things stood, and resolved to make one more effort to break through the toils that surrounded him. situation it is difficult to imagine than that at Kehoe's house. Every one knew that McKenna was under sentence of death, standing as it were on the very edge of his own grave, and yet no one spoke of this plain fact. McKenna knew that he was to be murdered immediately, his murderers knew that he knew it, and he again knew that they knew that he knew it. Yet no one used language which showed in any way what was to be end of 'the sleigh ride.' Murder was in every man's heart and a lie on every man's lips. While the 'Mollies' waited for some one to begin, McKenna played his last card :-

'A bright idea struck the detective. He would excite the sympathies of Mrs. Kehoe in his behalf. Mrs. Kehoe possessed considerable influence in "Molly" circles. She is an O'Donnell, a sister of Friday and Charles O'Donnell, a cousin of James Carroll's wife. She is a high-strung

t

۲.

n

5

n

ır

d

le

n

te

e

nt

10

ly ey

at

st,

ıt,

er

ıd

be

ut

m

ad

it.

ht

on

rt

er

se.

th,

ret

to

it,

ne

of

lie

ne

ies

ble

lay

8 8

ing

high-strung woman, of considerable force of character, but, like most people of quick emotion, sympathetic in temperament. McKenna found her in the kitchen, and to her, as his friend, he told his story, and to her knowledge of his full and entire devotion to the Order he appealed. He became very much affected as he recounted all he had done and sacrificed, and was then doing and sacrificing, to advance the general interest; but he said that he did not care for that: he was willing to do anything, to bear anything, except Mrs. Kehoe was fast giving way; her sympathies were suspicion. being excited. McKenna saw his advantage and clinched it. He could bear even suspicion, he said, but, after all he had done, not the charge of being an informer-not that; and then he pulled out his handkerchief and burst into tears. McKenna was not a beautiful object as he sat there in his red wig and rough dress; but the sympathies of the woman were fully aroused, and he was the conqueror. She grasped the poker, and vowed she would make anyone suffer who should attempt to touch him.'

Mrs. Kehoe's action prevented the murder taking place and enabled McKenna to start for Father O'Conner's. preceded, however, by two murderers, who determined that this time they would finish the job. Again, however, McAndrew intervened and prevented the plan being carried out. night came on, he for the third time saved the detective's life. The boarding house where McKenna was supposed to be sleeping was surrounded by 'Mollies' intent on murder, but in vain, for McAndrew had taken McKenna to sleep with him, and so had given them the slip. Another man would now at any rate have fled the district at once. Not so McKenna. He determined to keep up the farce of the injured conspirator a little longer, and to see the priest * who had denounced him as a detective. This he succeeded in doing. Having seen the priest, McKenna felt that his work was done, and next day he left the coal region for Philadelphia, only to reappear in the witness-box and give evidence against the conspirators. cannot dwell on the incidents of the trial, or relate how the inevitable informer appeared, and in order to save himself betrayed his old confederates. Suffice it to say, that McKenna's work was fully accomplished. By acting as a 'political spy' he broke up the 'Molly' organization, and since the convictions secured by means of his evidence the coal districts of Pennsylvania have been free from organized crime. Surely no one will deny that McKenna served the public honourably and well; that his taking and breaking of criminal oaths, his disguises,

^{*} This priest preached against the 'Mollies'; but, like a true Irishman, also denounced the man he suspected of being engaged in the work of bringing them to justice.

his spyings, and his betrayals of confidence, were fully justified.

In acting as a political spy he did nothing of which an honest

man need be ashamed.

Another competent and successful American political spy and organizer of secret service, was Mr. J. Schaack, Captain of Police in Chicago. It was he who hunted out and brought to justice the perpetrators of the dynamite explosions in 1886, and unearthed the plots of the Chicago anarchists. Very exciting are his accounts of how he obtained his clues; of the man with a thick veil over his face who gave him some most important information, but whose identity he never discovered; and of the man who dropped the letter in the street. One of the best stories told in Captain Schaack's book is that of a violent anarchist meeting at which one of Captain Schaack's spies was present in a professional capacity. In the middle of the meeting a haggard, wolfish-looking man rushed into the room, and asked that business should be suspended till he had gained his breath and could speak. When his power of speech returned, he declared that he had run from the other end of the city to tell the meeting that there was a spy in their midst. He did not know the man personally, but he had his description. 'Look round and point him out!' yelled the meeting. The wolfish man made his survey and pointed out the spy. It was an awkward moment, but Captain Schaack's man was equal to the emergency. Without a moment's hesitation he flung back the accusation, and declared that the new comer was an emissary of the police, and that he had seen him in company with the police. He enforced this by asking if any one present knew the map. Happily no one did, and that seemed to confirm the spy's story. 'Shall I shoot the bloodhound?' was the next question. The women, who played a large part in the anarchist movement in Chicago, were all for sudden vengeance. Wiser counsels, however, prevailed, and the man was simply kicked out. The spy then advised an instant adjournment, declaring that the police waggon might be upon them at any minute—a very necessary precaution, since some better known denouncer might have appeared. The meeting took this advice and at once dissolved itself. It is hardly necessary to say that after such an escape this particular spy did not again mix with the anarchists. Captain Schaack's detectives found it comparatively easy to gain access to the anarchist clubs. It was only necessary to declare that you were 'agin' law and When asked his name, the following answer made by one of the spies was held to be quite satisfactory: 'I don't give my name to people I don't know. I am against

against law and order, and that is sufficient. I don't believe in having good men hung to satisfy the rich. They will not hang if I can help any.' We have not space to tell how Captain Schaack hired the cellar under an anarchist meeting hall, bored a hole in the roof with an auger, and there stationed a detective and a stenographer who took a verbatim report of the speeches. We must, however, notice the strange and tragic end of one of the detectives. The anarchists discovered that he was a spy, and determined to get rid of him. This was their plan. A young and pretty female anarchist was employed to captivate the heart of the spy. This she did. It was then arranged that she should get the spy to take her out in a boat on the lake in one of the Chicago parks. They were followed by another boat full of anarchists. At a signal the girl jumped up and capsized her boat. The anarchists were of course to row up and save the girl, letting the spy drown. By some accident, however, this part of the plan failed, and both the spy and the girl employed to remove him sunk before the second boat reached

It would be an omission to treat of spies and not to say something of the political spies with which Southern Europe swarmed during the middle of the present century. In Mr. Nassau Senior's journals in France and Italy, and in his conversations with eminent foreign statesmen, there are numerous allusions to spies. For example, when in 1851 Mr. Senior asked a well-known Italian patriot, 'Are there many spies in Rome?' he received the answer, 'The whole population may be divided into the spies and the spied upon. There is not a waiter who does not receive a few pauls a month for relating what he hears.' We get also a curious picture of some of the spies who were employed by foreign Governments to watch the political refugees in London in Mr. Holyoake's interesting book, 'Sixty Years of an Agitator's Life.' Mr. Holyoake, we suspect, somewhat exaggerates the employment of spies by the Government during the Chartist agitation in 1839. We cannot, however, deal with this portion of his chapter on spies, or combat his general attack on spying in time of peace. All we can do is to call attention to his curious description of certain foreign spies with whom he was intimate for several years, and to advise those of our readers who are specially interested in the subject of political espionage to refer to his book.

We must not leave the subject of the present article without pointing out the political lessons which are to be learned from the doings of the Irish secret societies in Pennsylvania. Many well-meaning and intelligent Englishmen and Scotchmen, who deplore the condition of lawlessness and of organized crime common in Ireland, are just now apt to be influenced by the argument, that Irish outrages are the product of English rule,. and that, if once the authority of the hated Saxon were removed, Ireland would sink into a condition of social peace. 'Remove,' it is said, 'the influence of England, and Irishmen will no longer countenance murder and outrage, or combine in secret societies to defeat the ends of justice.' The history of the Molly Maguires shows how utterly fallacious is this argument. In Pennsylvania the Irish were never trodden under the heel of the Saxon conqueror. Law did not present itself to them in a foreign garb. They were neither persecuted, despised, nor suspected. Instead they were the favoured citizens of a commonwealth in every way sympathetic with their political and social aspirations - a commonwealth in which there existed no trace of landlord, of Protestant or aristocratic ascendency, and in which every office and function of Government was controlled by popular election. Yet when a colony of Irishmen gathered together in Pennsylvania, the political and social configuration of Ireland was exactly repeated, and the condition of one of the counties of an American State became that of Clare or Kerry during the crisis of an agrarian agitation. It is the most foolish of delusions to imagine that Irishmen only defy the law in Ireland, or that England is responsible for the tolerance of crime which they display. By withdrawing English influence from Ireland we shall in no way prevent the growth of organizations such as those of the Molly Maguires. There is only one way to eradicate lawlessness in Ireland. Irishmen tolerate outrage because they are suffering from an arrested social and political development. Ireland was still in the throes of anarchy when England and the rest of Europe were being painfully taught the needs and uses of good government. Ireland in fact is, as regards law and order, some three hundred years behind the rest of the United Kingdom. But she may still learn her 'civil drill' just as England learned it. All that is necessary is to persist tirelessly, and yet at the same time sympathetically, in the work of education. The task is by no means an impossible one. What is required are time and That no doubt is a less sensational remedy than the establishment of civil war by Act of Parliament, but it is one we submit which is likely to prove far more effective than Mr. Gladstone's Bill for the better Government of Ireland.

ART. X.—A Leap in the Dark; or, Our New Constitution. By A. V. Dicey, Q.C. London, 1893.

T is probable that when our days have become subjectsof historical research, the Niebuhrs and Grotes and Mommsens of the future will labour under a task the reverseof that with which their predecessors had to struggle. The difficulty of reconstructing the historic periods of Athens and Rome lies in the paucity of contemporary records; the difficulty of reconstructing the Victorian period of English history will lie in the plethora of such records. If it is hard tomake bricks without straw, it is harder still to make bricks when the clay is imbedded in huge piles of straw; and the search for a needle in a hay-stack will be a less onerous task than that of eliminating facts from the mass of newspaper reports and articles, in which they will have to be looked for at some future day by the narrators of the story of our times. In this story there will be few chapters more difficult of comprehension than that which has to deal with the rise, decline, and fall of the Home Rule movement; and out of sympathy, alike with. the professors and students of the far-away hereafter, we would express a pious hope that the remarkable book, the title of which is placed at the head of this article, may prove part of that flotsam and jetsam of literature which escapes the flood of oblivion. 'A Leap in the Dark' is a work written for the Its object is to point out to the men of our time the dangers inseparable from the crazy project into which the country is being led, or, at any rate, is very near being led, under the guidance and at the instance of Mr. Gladstone. Nothing could have been better timed than this indictment of Home Rule, viewed as a contribution to contemporary politics. But 'A Leap in the Dark' contains so fair, so clear, and socomprehensive a statement of the grounds, on which the Unionist party deem it their duty to fight the campaign against. Home Rule to the bitter end, that the work in question would prove of invaluable assistance to any future historian of our times; and it is on this account we think it possible its term of existence may far outlive the span of life allotted as a rule toworks dealing with the political controversies of the day, Habent sua fata libelli: and it would not surprise us if we were told that in times to come, 'A Leap in the Dark' would be regarded as one of the text-books of that period of our national history, which for evil or for good turns on the success or failure of the Home Rule agitation.

The work under notice is so concise and so clearly argued,

that it is difficult to discuss it fully or fairly without almost reproducing it in its entirety. All we can do now is to bring out a few points in Professor Dicey's lucid exposition, which seem to us to call for especial notice. It is commonly taken for granted that the retention of the Irish representatives in the Imperial Parliament is, in some form or other, a direct recognition of the supremacy of that Parliament, and that therefore it should remove to some extent the objections entertained by Unionists to the establishment of a Parliament at Dublin. This opinion is mainly held by the more moderate section of English Gladstonians and by the advanced wing of the Liberal Unionists. The view is based upon a fallacy which Professor Dicey exposes with his usual clearness.

The best conceivable result of Home Rule is that it may detach Irishmen from interest in English politics, and induce the most respected and respectable men in Ireland to take matters into their own hands and manage for themselves all strictly Irish affairs. For the last twenty years, at least, Ireland has been represented, or misrepresented, by eighty or more politicians, nominated in the main by Mr. Parnell. No one supposes for a moment that the Nationalist leaders, who appeared before and were condemned by the Special Commission, are fair samples of the Irish people. They are, take them at their best, reckless agitators. They were chosen by their patron, Mr. Parnell, not on account of their worth or talent, but because they were apt instruments for carrying out a policy of Parliamentary intrigue, reinforced by a system of lawless oppression. These men are the product of a revolutionary era; they no more represent the virtues and the genius of the Irish people than the demagogues or fanatics of the Jacobin Club represented the genius and the virtues of the French nation. We all know that Ireland abounds in citizens of a very different stamp. She has never lacked among her sons, and does not lack now, men of virtue, of vigour, and of genius. Throughout the length and breadth of the country you will find hundreds of men of merit-landlords whose lives have been honourable to themselves and a blessing to their tenants; merchants as honest and successful as any in England or in Scotland; small landowners and tenant farmers, who have paid their rent and paid their way, who have cultivated their land, who have never insulted or boycotted their neighbours, and have never been driven by intimidation into meanness and fraud. Add to these lawyers, thinkers, writers, and scholars, who rival or excel the best representatives of their class in other parts of the United Kingdom. These good men and true are not peculiar to any one creed or party; they are not confined to any one province, or to any one class; they are scattered through every part of the land; they are the true backbone of Ireland; they have saved her from utter ruin; they may still by their energy raise her to prosperity. But they have been thrust out of politics by the talkers, the adventurers, the conspirators. It is possible that, if Home Rule compels Irishmen to turn their whole minds to Irish affairs, the so-called representatives who misrepresent their country may be dismissed from the world of politics, and the Parliament at Dublin be filled with members, who, whether they come from the North or from the South, whether Unionists or Home Rulers, whether Roman Catholics or Protestants, whether landowners, tenant farmers, ministers of religion, merchants, or tradesmen, represent the real worth and strength of the country. If this should happen, Home Rule would still entail great evils on the whole United Kingdom. But even zealous Unionists might hope that for these evils Ireland at least will obtain some compensation. This hope, if the Irish members are retained at Westminster, will never be fulfilled.

In fact, Home Rule, if carried out on the principles of the Bill now before Parliament, would combine the maximum disadvantage to Great Britain with the minimum of advantage to Ireland. Our home politics and our home administration would still be paralysed by the presence at Westminster of some eighty or a hundred members who would practically be the delegates of the Irish Parliament, who would have no direct interest of their own in our affairs, and whose vote would be at the services of any party prepared to pay for their support on a division by any concessions which their principals at Dublin might think fit to exact. No possible arrangement could be better adapted to demoralize the British House of Commons, to degrade its authority, and to impair its independence. On the other hand, the presence at Westminster of these paid delegates would exhaust the scanty supply of political ability available in Ireland, would lead the Irish to look to Parliamentary intrigue rather than to their own efforts for the reconstruction of their country and the development of its resources under the new conditions created by the concession of Home Rule, would reproduce the corruption and venality which proved fatal to Grattan's Parliament, and would thus deprive Ireland of the services of the men of character and standing, who alone could make Home Rule a success in so far as Ireland is concerned. The more this point is brought out the better. We have every hope and belief that the Home Rule movement will receive its final deathblow at the next General Election. Still we have to deal with a most uncertain quantity, the caprice of a half-educated and almost indifferent Electorate, influenced in its judgment by personal and local considerations far more than by any logical approval or disapproval of Home Rule. Under these circumstances, it is folly to lose sight of the possibility that the Liberals may obtain a new and even larger majority on a second

second appeal to the constituencies. In this contingency, the position of the Unionists and the attitude of the House of Lords would be materially changed. It is impossible for the hereditary chamber to place itself in permanent opposition to the declared will of the people as signified at the polls. As things are, nobody can gainsay the right and even the duty of the Lords to reject the Home Rule Bill on the ground that it has never yet really received the sanction of the country. But if, no matter on what grounds or by what devices, the country should beinduced, after the rejection of the Bill, to return again a majority favourable to Mr. Gladstone and his Home Rule policy, this plea would be no longer available. Still, even in such a case, the Lords would be amply justified in making their consent to pass the Bill when presented a second time, conditional upon the exclusion of the Irish members from the Imperial Parliament, and by so stipulating they would render the leap in the dark involved in the concession of Home Rule to Ireland less hurtful and less dangerous to Great Britain than it would be otherwise.

We are not altogether clear as to the expediency of Professor-Dicey's proposal that the introduction of the Referendum system should form part of the Unionist programme, which, by the way, has since been spoken of approvingly by Lord Salisbury in his address to the Junior Constitutional Club. There is great force in the Professor's arguments, of which we can only give the following extract:—

^{&#}x27;The most important function of the House of Lords at the present day is to take care that no fundamental change in the constitution takes place which has not received the undoubted assent of the nation. The Peers are more and more clearly awakening to the knowledge that, under the circumstances of modern public life, this protection of the rights of the nation, which is in complete conformity with democratic principle, is the supreme duty of the Upper House.

^{&#}x27;The question, however, to be considered at the moment is whether for the performance of this duty something more may not be required than the compelling of a Dissolution. This something more is a direct appeal to the electors in the nature of a Referendum. The question is still a theoretical one; it cannot (unfortunately as it will appear to many persons) be raised during the debates on the Bill in the House of Commons. When the Bill reaches the House of Lords it will, we may suppose, be rejected, and all that a Unionist can wish for is, first, that before actual rejection, its general principles should be subjected to complete discussion, and, what is in this case the same thing, exposure; and next, that the House of Lords should, if necessary, take steps which can easily be imagined, for providing that the rejection of the Bill shall entail a Dissolution. If, however, the Dissolution should result in a Gladstonian majority, and should

lead to another Home Rule Bill being sent up to their Lordships, the question then arises as to the Referendum. My own conviction, which has been before laid before the public, is that the Lords would do well if they appended to any Home Rule Bill, which they were prepared to accept, a clause which might make its coming into force depend upon its, within a limited time, receiving the approval of the majority of the electors of the United Kingdom. And in the particular case of the Home Rule Bill it is fair, for reasons already stated, that the Bill before becoming law should receive the assent of a majority of the electors both of Great Britain and of Ireland. course, it may be said, is unconstitutional. This word has no terrors for me; it means no more than unusual, and the institution of a Referendum would simply mean the formal acknowledgment of the doctrine which lies at the basis of English democracy—that a law depends at bottom for its enactment on the assent of the nation as represented by the electors. At a time when the true danger is that sections or classes should arrogate to themselves authority which belongs to the State, it is an advantage to bring into prominence the sovereignty of the nation. The present is exactly a crisis at which we may override the practices to save the principles of the Constitu-The most forcible objection which can be made is that you ought not for the sake of avoiding a particular evil to introduce an innovation of dubious expediency. The objection itself is valid, but it is in the present instance inapplicable. . . . In any case, the time has arrived when the Unionist statesmen should consider the expediency of announcing that no Home Rule Bill will finally be accepted until it has undergone a reference to and received the approval of the electors. On no better issue could battle be joined with revolutionists than on the question whether the people of the United Kingdom should or should not be allowed to express their will. Unionists have every reason to feel confidence in their cause: their only policy, their one path of safety is to make it, as they can do, absolutely plain that they rely upon justice, and that they appeal from parties to the nation.'

In theory the Professorial argument is unanswerable; but in practice we question its cogency. The Referendum is, we fancy, only possible in small States, where the great mass of the electors have an individual, if not an intelligent, opinion on the issues submitted to them. But it would not, we think, work in England, at any rate in the present stage of her political development. If Home Rule could be submitted to a Referendum, the educated and thinking electors would no doubt vote according to their views, whether right or wrong, as to the merits or demerits of the proposed alteration of our Constitution. But under present conditions, the educated and thinking classes are in a hopeless minority; supreme political power rests with the masses; and the masses are, as a body, indifferent about Home Rule.

Rule. Thus a Referendum vote would not, so far as the mass of the electorate are concerned, differ in any material respect from any ordinary election vote, and would be given one way or another, not in accordance with any definite opinion as to the issue submitted, but in accordance with the general, local, or personal considerations which determine the electorate of any constituency to vote for one party in preference to another. If the United Kingdom returned a Gladstonian or a Unionist majority at the next Election, we feel confident that the result of a plebiscite on the subject of Home Rule, if held at or about the same time, would result in the proposal being approved or rejected by much the same proportion of votes. Moreover, the ordinary British elector, whether Conservative or Liberal in politics, has an extreme dislike to any innovation, and would resent what he would regard as a new-fangled system of eliciting his opinion. The object aimed at by the Referendum is practically secured—by the House of Lords refusing to pass any Bill of grave constitutional importance until the principle of the Bill has been ratified at a General Election, after due time has been given for its consideration and discussion. So long as this duty is fulfilled, the House of Lords, as Professor Dicey himself admits, supplies an effectual barrier against ill-considered changes; and the object of all who value our existing institutions should, we think, be directed rather to strengthening the hereditary chamber than to looking out for new and more doubtful safeguards.

Still, we are fully in accord with Professor Dicev in holding that no matter what may be the action of the heterogeneous coalition of English Radicals, Gladstonian Liberals, Scotchand Welsh Liberationists, and Irish Nationalists, who in the present House of Commons constitute a narrow majority in favour of Home Rule, that action cannot be accepted by the House of Lords, till the question at issue has been clearly submitted to the electorate of the United Kingdom and has received their definite and deliberate sanction. The author of 'A Leap in the Dark' seems disposed to carry his argument to the length of contending that no modification of the Act of Union would be valid unless it received the separate assent of Great Britain as well as of Ireland; this assent being signified, if we follow his reasoning correctly, by a vote of the majority of the representatives of each country. It would follow that until the Home Rulers could convert the Unionist majority in England, which now stands at over seventy, into a minority, Home Rule could never be carried by any vote of the Imperial Parliament. We quite agree in thinking that the Act of

Union

Union was a partnership, and that, in public as in private life, one partner cannot leave his firm and withdraw his capital without his co-partners having a right to a voice in the matter. But we think Professor Dicey overlooks an objection which invalidates the analogy between the Union and a private partnership. By the terms of the Union, the Imperial Parliament was constituted the supreme authority in all affairs concerning the United Kingdom. In fact, though not in name, the British Parliament equally with the Irish Parliament ceased to exist when the Act of Union was passed. Henceforward the whole United Kingdom was represented by one Parliament, and it seems to us difficult to argue that this Parliament, if it sees due cause, cannot alter the Act of Union without obtaining the special sanction of each one of the States of which the United Kingdom is composed. It may be said that a similar contention was put forward, and put forward successfully, by the Federal States on the outbreak of the Secession War. But the difference between the two cases lies in this, that the American Congress had never passed a vote sanctioning secession. Had they done so, it would have been difficult for the Northern-States to assert that the right of secession was inadmissible in theory, though doubtless—theory or no theory—they would have asserted it in practice.

It was no part of the author's case to suggest any objections to his contention which were not put forward by his opponents. Mr. Albert Dicey, besides being an eminent authority on Constitutional Law, is an experienced advocate, of recognized ability; and he has all the instincts of the profession to which he belongs. Now one of the most elementary rules of English advocacy is that, if the plaintiff's opponents have a plea of which, for some reason or other, they are unwilling toavail themselves, it is not the duty of the counsel for the defence to argue against this plea so long as it is not before the Court. In matters of law this view of an advocate's functions is unimpeachable, but in matters of history there is something to be said for a different point of view. In order to bring out distinctly the real strength of any policy, it is necessary to take into account not only the objections which were raised by its antagonists, but the objections they might have raised had they either been better advised or had been at liberty to speak out their minds. Now, we have always felt that to many of the strictures contained in 'A Leap in the Dark,' and still more to those contained in the preceding work of the same author, 'The Verdict,' the partisans of Home Rule had a defence far more effective than those which they habitually employed. When the Home Rule controversy becomes matter of history, this defence will infallibly be put forward by the advocates of the Nationalist cause. It is therefore worth while to state briefly what the nature of this defence is, and to show that, even admitting its validity up to a certain point, it fails entirely to make out an effective plea for the concession of Home Rule.

Throughout all his writings, Professor Dicey, in common. for that matter, with most of the Liberal Unionists, seems to us to attach a somewhat excessive importance to the finding of the Parnell Commission. We fully admit that a number of crimes, intrigues, and illegal actions were clearly brought home to the Nationalist party by the investigations of Lord Hannen and his colleagues. We admit, too, that the language in which these offences were condemned did not err, if it erred at all, on the side of undue severity, and that the Court displayed excessive leniency in declining to assign the direct personal responsibility of these offences to the party on whose behalf and for whose benefit they were committed. We admit, finally, that the charges, if their authorship could have been distinctly assigned, would have merited severe and condign punishment. Yet we cannot conceal from ourselves that, if the Nationalists had turned to bay and had been able to speak the truth without endangering their cause, they would have had a defence it would not have been easy to answer. That defence would have, in effect, been this: 'We have been making a revolution, and revolutions are not made with rose-water. We wanted to free Ireland from Saxon rule, and we had no time to pick and choose our instruments: we, a weak, poor, and distracted country, had to overthrow the power of a strong, wealthy, and united kingdom; and not being able to take up arms, we had to carry on a clandestine warfare by underhand violence and surreptitious outrage. It is idle of you to complain because we employed the only weapons at our disposal, or to brand us as criminals because we fought our war subject to the conditions under which alone success was possible.' To this line of argument we fail to see any adequate answer, if you adhere to the commonplace Liberal theory of the sacred right of insurrec-Of course, the Parnellites could not put forward this defence openly. In order to retain the support of their Liberal allies, it was essential these allies should be able to assure the British public that the agitation for Home Rule was of a strictly constitutional character, and was entirely opposed to any revolutionary action. Granted this necessity, Mr. Parnell and his followers were debarred from their one logical line of defence, and had to be content with trying to explain away the outrages of

which they stood accused, to show that there was no evidence directly associating them with specific crimes, and to condemn the very actions which, whether justifiable or unjustifiable, had been the cause of such success as had attended their agitation, But though the plea we have referred to was kept sedulously in the background, a sort of popular instinct led the public to perceive that the ethics of revolutionary eras are not the same as those of ordinary epochs; and that, if the Nationalists were really engaged in a revolution, their offences, heinous as they might be, belonged to a different category from those of ordinary malefactors. It was this instinct which neutralized the effect of the verdict of the Parnell Commission, and it is the failure to recognize the force of this plea which to some extent has impaired the strength of the protest raised against the Home Rule agitation on the ground of its supposed association with crime and outrage. The real gravamen of the indictment against the Nationalists is, not that being engaged in a revolution they resorted to revolutionary measures, but that they engaged in a revolution without any adequate justification.

0

a,

IS

le

s,

e

e

e

e

e

e

d

ıt

it

d

ı,

O

d

d

d

d

d

0

1

Owing partly to his constitutional inability to state a case plainly, and still more to his intense unwillingness to admit that any measure sanctioned by his approval is open to criticism, Mr. Gladstone has always shrunk from employing the one defence that can be urged with any show of reason, on behalf of his Home Rule Bill. And as his followers derive their ideas from his inspiration, we hear little or nothing of the 'choice-of-evils' argument, which, to our thinking, constitutes the strongest plea for the Repeal of the Union. It may be well, therefore, to state this plea, as simply and as fairly as we can. The English Gladstonians, if they understood their brief, might reply to the author of the 'Leap in the Dark' in the following fashion: 'We fully admit the objections that you raise, we are alive to the dangers you point out, and, even though we may regard your fears as somewhat exaggerated and your objections as in some instances overstrained, we agree with you that in according Home Rule to Ireland we are trying a very doubtful and dangerous experiment. But our contention is that the Repeal of the Union is a less evil than the continuance of the present system. The British electorate, with its democratic ideas and institutions, would never consent to deprive Ireland of her political rights or to govern her as a Crown Colony; yet, if Ireland is to be left in possession of Parliamentary representation, no Liberal administration, without being false to the fundamental principles of Liberalism, can resist the demand of the Irish for self-Vol. 177.—No. 353. government.

T

government. From the time that Ireland, under Mr. Parnell's leadership, returned a solid phalanx of some fourscore Home Rulers, the Liberal party had to choose between granting Home Rule and sacrificing its reason of being. The latter we are not prepared to do: the former, therefore, we must do, notwithstanding any risks that may be inseparable from the performance of our duty. The democracy of Great Britain will never consent to the prolonged coercion of the sister kingdom: the Irish democracy will never consent to forego the fulfilment of its national aspirations. We are brought, therefore, to a dead lock. From this dead lock there is one way of escape, and one way only, and that way is to be found in obeying the cardinal tenet of Liberalism, and in accepting the will of the Irish people as manifested by their elected representatives.'

If indeed Ireland cannot be ruled except by coercion, if coercion is incompatible with the instincts and convictions of the British nation, then Home Rule is the only solution of the dilemma; and to show that this solution is surrounded by any number of difficulties and dangers, is not a sufficient answer to its adoption. Granted the Gladstonian premises, there is no gainsaying the Gladstonian conclusion—but our contention is that the premises are erroneous. We can best judge of the future by the experience of the past: and if it can be shown that the demand for Home Rule is no new development, but a mere outbreak of popular impatience, stirred up by unscrupulous agitators, and that similar outbreaks have repeatedly occurred before, and have as repeatedly died away for lack of inherent vitality, then the one argument in favour of Home Rule which appeals to thinking men is cut to the ground.

It may not therefore be useless to recall the origin of the Home Rule movement. During the years which elapsed between the enactment of the Union and the final close of the Napoleonic wars, England had neither time nor thought to spare for Irish matters: and so long as this state of things endured, the Irish, whatever their feelings may have been, accepted the Union, as all nations, and especially all Celtic nations, accept accomplished facts. It was only when peace was assured that popular attention was turned to Parliamentary Reform in this country, and to Catholic Emancipation in Ireland. It was in 1830, on the eve of the Reform Bill being passed, that the Repeal of the Union was first put forward by O'Connell

as the panacea for the evils that afflicted Ireland.

In 1830 the Liberator wrote to one of his supporters:

^{&#}x27;There never was a more critical or important period, or one in which an extensive demand for the Repeal of the Union would have a better

a better effect. . . . You cannot conceive what a change has occurred already in the public mind here on the subject of the Repeal of the Union. It is not only practical but certain, if we persevere as we ought to do. . . If the people will keep quiet and allow me to legislate, I think I am certain of procuring the Repeal of the Union.'

At this period, O'Connell was buoyed up by his recent success in the cause of Catholic Emancipation, and was misled by the assurances of sympathy and support he received from the Whigs. After the fashion of English party politics, Lord Althorp and his colleagues were bidding for the Irish vote in Parliament, and were only too glad to secure that vote by vague professions, which there was no idea on their part of carrying out in earnest. This fact O'Connell does not seem to have realized till a much later date. In the remarkable correspondence of the Liberator, compiled by Mr. Fitzpatrick, from which the above and the following extracts are taken, nothing is more obvious to the English reader than O'Connell's apparent incapacity to understand English politics and English politicians. At the period of which we are writing, O'Connell not only believed that the Whigs were going to fight side by side with him for the Repeal of the Union, but—a less excusable error-he gravely declares that the mere announcement of his intention to take up the cause of Repeal had scattered consternation among the Tories.

Nothing, however, came either of Tory terrors or Whig sympathies. It was only in 1834 that O'Connell summoned up heart to bring a motion before Parliament in favour of Repeal. At the commencement of the Session he had given notice of a resolution 'That the House should take the Act of Union into consideration with a view to its repeal.' But this proposal encountered so little sympathy outside his own immediate following, that he elected to try his strength on a second resolution, which was originally intended as a corollary to the first, calling for the appointment of a Committee to enquire into the means by which the dissolution of the Grattan Parliament was effected, and into the results of the measure in question, and 'the probable consequences of continuing legislative Union.' The support given to the motion was fainthearted: the opposition to it was overwhelming, not only in numbers, but in authority. Mr. Spring Rice, Lord Althorp, and Sir Robert Peel denounced the proposal as monstrous; and the words of the last-named statesman have a strange significance at the present moment :-

^{&#}x27;The security of the Empire depended on the maintanance of the Union, without which England would be reduced to the condition of

a fourth-class Power in Europe, and Ireland to the desolation of a wilderness. Looking at the relative positions of the islands with the other Powers of Europe and the Empire rising on the other side of the Atlantic, it was impossible not at once to perceive the impracticability and madness of such a proposition as that before the House. Nature herself proclaimed the folly of such a scheme. . . The establishment of a really independent legislation in Ireland would lead to incalculable evils in the administration of the offices of the country. The one Executive and Parliament of the Empire would be continually coming into collision with the other. . . . It could not safely be left to Ireland to fix her own proportion of the public burdens of the two countries; and in the settlement of the commercial system or on the subject of foreign relations, the very existence of two independent legislatures would involve both countries in inextricable difficulties.

It was felt by the Ministry of the day that the attack on the integrity of the United Kingdom ought to be rejected in such a manner as to leave no possibility of doubt as to the views of Parliament. A call, therefore, of the House was made, and in the division only 38 members voted for the resolution, while 523 voted against its adoption. In the minority there was only one single member not representing an Irish constituency, while in the muster roll of the majority there is, we believe, to be found the name of our present Prime Minister. By a strange irony of fate, after the lapse of some threescore years, a Bill, introduced by Mr. Gladstone to carry out the Repeal which O'Connell advocated, will, in all human likelihood, be rejected by the House of Lords within the next few weeks by a majority of much the same proportions as that which in 1834 gave the quietus to this insane and impracticable project.

If one reads between the lines of O'Connell's letters to his confidants, after the rejection of his motion, it is obvious that, notwithstanding his colossal vanity, he was conscious the demonstration had proved a fiasco. All he can say in his own defence is that he has achieved a moral victory and produced an effect on public opinion in England. Deeds, however, are stronger than phrases, and the practical outcome of the debate was that, within a few days of the division, O'Connell agreed to drop Repeal for the time being, in consideration of the Whigs agreeing to support him in obtaining concessions on

the Tithe question.

The respite, however, was not of long duration. At the General Election in 1837, which ensued on the Accession of Her Majesty, O'Connell, according to the statement of his biographer, re-entered Parliament at the head of 73 Repealers. The Irish Nationalists in those days were included in the

Parliamentary

Parliamentary lists as Liberals, so that it is not easy to verify the accuracy of the statement. Yet, somehow or other, this demonstration of the Nationalist aspirations of Ireland produced no effect whatever on the British Parliament, or even on the English Liberals. Possibly the significance of the return of so large a number of Separatists was diminished by public knowledge of the fact recorded in O'Connell's letters at this time, 'There was never a man so besieged by persons looking for places.' The support of the Irish vote was essential to Lord Melbourne's Ministry; and therefore, as they could not meet O'Connell's views with regard to Home Rule, they were ready to conciliate him in every way by acceding to his recommendations on behalf of his friends and supporters. The best way, therefore, to get a place was to be a Home Ruler, and of this fact the keen intelligence of the Hibernian mind did not fail

to take cognizance.

In this hunt for place, O'Connell himself took no personal part. The 'rent' was a more lucrative source of income than any official salary; moreover, his good and his bad qualities alike disqualified him for the routine duties of public service. We do not dispute the sincerity of O'Connell's belief in Home Rule, though we incline to think his belief was mainly due to a conviction, that the Repeal of the Union would serve the interests of the Catholic priesthood in Ireland, of which he was in reality the loyal champion and spokesman. But it is impossible to peruse the wearisome recital of his personal pecuniary difficulties, as given in his correspondence, without coming to the conclusion that, even if he was sincere in his advocacy of Repeal, this advocacy was almost incumbent upon him as the one means of maintaining his position as the paid champion of Irish Nationalism. With singular naïveté, Mr. Fitzpatrick informs us that on the night when Catholic Emancipation was finally ratified by Parliament, one of his faithful henchmen, with whom after his wont he subsequently quarrelled, said to O'Connell: 'Othello's occupation's gone,'

'Gone!' was the reply, 'isn't there the Repeal of the Union?' O'Connell's close connexion with Lord Melbourne's Ministry, though, as we admit, not dishonourable to himself, had injured him in the estimation of his Nationalist supporters. In order to recover his somewhat impaired popularity, the Liberator made up his mind in 1840 to resume the agitation for Home Rule. After his wont, he commenced the agitation by endeavouring to enlist on its behalf the active support of the Irish Catholic clergy, and writes to Archbishop McHale in almost servile language, imploring his aid in the crusade for

Repeal,

Repeal, and assures his Grace that the measure would of course sanction in the fullest measure the spiritual authority of the episcopal order over religious discipline amidst Catholics, including Catholic education. Apparently there was no response to this appeal, for the Repeal agitation, though started in 1840, was allowed to slumber till after the return of the Conservatives to office under Sir Robert Peel. As usual, the prospect of a long exclusion from power stimulated the Irish proclivities of the Whigs, and, with or without reason, O'Connell was led to believe that a Repeal movement would be met, to say the least, with benevolent neutrality on the part of the Liberal Opposition. In 1843 O'Connell commenced to 'stump' Ireland in earnest on behalf of Home Rule. A series of mass meetings was instituted under the Liberator's personal supervision. Athlone, Dunkalk, and Enniskillen were the scenes of the first popular demonstrations in favour of Repeal. Then came the monster meeting at Tara, and the numbers collected here were estimated by the 'Times,' so Mr. Fitzpatrick alleges, at close upon a million. This estimate seems to us as mythical as the legends which connect Tara with the imaginary glories of Hibernian royalty. The population of Ireland never, at the highest, exceeded eight millions, and out of such a number there could not, according to the usual averages, be more than a million and a quarter of male adults. It would therefore follow that out of every five grown-up men in the whole island, four were present at Tara. Still, after making every deduction, the Tara meeting assumed proportions which threatened public tranquillity, and the same may be said of the subsequent demonstration at Mullaghmast. The Government interfered. all further open-air Repeal meetings were prohibited, and O'Connell was placed on his trial for having used language calculated to bring about a breach of the peace. The trial resulted in his conviction, and, after some delay, he was finally sentenced to a year's imprisonment and to a fine of 2,000l. The verdict, however, was upset by an appeal to the House of Lords on more or less technical grounds; and, after a few weeks' detention, O'Connell was set at liberty.

It might have been thought that the proceedings of the Imperial Government would have given fresh force to the Repeal agitation. On the contrary, it collapsed like a bubble that has been pricked, the moment the Government put its foot down in earnest. At Tara, O'Connell had pledged his word that before twelve months were over an Irish Parliament would be sitting in College Green. Yet when the Liberator left prison, with all the prestige of a patriot who had been the

victim.

hardly

victim of an unjust sentence for his devotion to the Nationalist cause, his first act was to drop Repeal. He himself admitted that it would be idle to attempt to revive the monster meetings, and gave in his adhesion to a sort of diluted Repeal scheme advocated by the Catholic clergy, under which Ireland was to be a Federal State in a Confederation of the United Kingdom. The scheme died still-born, and for years to come nothing more was heard of Repeal. The tribute dropped off, and O'Connell's place as a popular leader was taken by Smith O'Brien and the leaders of the Young Ireland party, who advocated physical, as

opposed to moral, force.

The short remnant of O'Connell's political life, after the collapse of the Repeal agitation, was occupied with renewed attempts to form an alliance between the Irish Nationalists and the English Liberals: and with this object he seems to have been willing to drop the idea of an independent Parliament altogether, if the Whigs would co-operate with him in obtaining for Ireland 'equal franchises, equal representation, equal rights, equal religious freedom—in short, equal laws with those enjoyed by the people of England.' All these demands have long ago been granted—and yet now we are told Ireland will only be contented provided the Union is repealed. The value of such assurances is illustrated by the fact that O'Connell, when examined before a Parliamentary Committee, previous to the passing of the Catholic Emancipation Bill, gave his solemn assurance that, if the Catholics were emancipated, the Irish

would be perfectly satisfied with the Union. After O'Connell's death, the Repeal agitation slumbered for a considerable period. Before the final break-down of the Liberator's energies, the 'Young Ireland' party had rebelled against his authority and denounced his policy of constitutional agitation. Indeed, the defection of the younger Home Rulers contributed in no small degree to the other causes which broke the spirit, if not the heart, of the greatest of Irish popular leaders. Smith O'Brien and 'Meagher of the sword' had usurped his place as the champions of the national aspirations of Ireland. Their contention was that all attempts to secure independence by Parliamentary coalitions and intrigues were foredoomed to failure, and that, if Ireland was ever to be made free, it must be by armed conspiracy, and in the end by open insurrection. Logically, they were in the right; and mad as was the Fenian. rising that began and ended in the ludicrous fiasco of the cabbage field, it does not seem so utterly insane in view of the subsequent events of 1848, when well-nigh every dynasty and every established Government in Europe were upset by risings

hardly in themselves more formidable than that conducted by the 'Young Ireland' party. As things were, however, the utter, complete, and contemptible collapse of the Fenian insurrection discredited for the time the whole Nationalist movement, and Ireland enjoyed an interval of repose and tranquillity till O'Connell's policy was taken up again under the leadership of Isaac Butt.

The career of this gentleman was typical of the class to which he belonged, and with which we have of late been undesirably familiar. He had started on his political career as an Irish Conservative, and a bitter personal opponent of O'Connell. When the Liberator died, Mr. Butt apparently thought the reversion of the Liberatorship was worth securing, and, though remaining nominally a Conservative, he undertook the defence of Smith O'Brien and Meagher when on their trial for the abortive rising of Ballingarry, and later on became the recognized counsel for the Fenian prisoners. Like O'Connell, he had a very large practice at the Irish Bar, and, like O'Connell, he was always in pecuniary straits. The difference between the two men was that even O'Connell's enemies never believed he could be bought, while even Mr. Butt's friends never felt sure he could not be bought. He made some successful speeches in Parliament, was talked of as a rising man, tried to identify himself with the then moribund Protectionist agitation, and somehow failed to make his mark. The Conservatives distrusted him, and fought shy of him; the Liberals were not anxious for his support; and the Nationalist movement had apparently died away with the death of O'Connell. It was during Mr. Gladstone's administration in 1873 that Home Rule was again heard of, after a quarter of a century of suspended animation. The disestablishment of the Irish Church had for the time alienated the sympathies of the Irish Protestants. Very general dissatisfaction was felt in the North at the system of party government, under which the Church of Ireland had been sacrificed to advance the political interests of the English Liberals; and there was a partial return of the state of public sentiment, which at the time of the Irish volunteers had made the Orangemen the champions of Home Rule. Mr. Butt came forward as the spokesman of this popular discontent, and resumed the campaign fought by O'Connell, with the difference that, instead of asking directly for Repeal, he asked for it indirectly under the name of Home Rule. As usual, Mr. Gladstone endeavoured to secure the support of the new Irish party, and, as usual, the negociations for a coalition fell through, because Mr. Gladstone was not at that time ready or able to grant the terms that the Home Rulers demanded as the price of their vote. At the General Election which ensued on the downfall of the Gladstone Ministry, Mr. Butt returned to Parliament at the head of some threescore Irish Home Rulers, many of whom, such as Pope-Hennessy, were elected as Conservatives, and represented rather the general dislike with which the policy of the Liberals was regarded in Ireland than any deliberate desire for legislative independence. Mr. Butt made a number of motions in favour of Home Rule which were uniformly rejected, and delivered a number of speeches in Ireland which attracted a certain amount of popular attention. But on the whole, the new Home Rule agitation was a failure. For good or for evil, Isaac Butt was not one of the men who make history. He had not O'Connell's eloquence, he had not O'Connell's commanding personality, and, justly or unjustly, he was regarded as a place hunter. His scheme of Home Rule was too violent for moderate men, too moderate for violent men, and fell between two stools. His leadership was disputed by Parnell; and Isaac Butt died having effected no end, and obtained no appointment.

Parnell's record is too fresh and too vivid in public recoldection to require any recital here. All we need say is, he discovered the two principles on which alone any Home Rule agitation could be conducted with the least chance of success. The first was, that Home Rule must be identified with an agrarian agitation for the forced transfer of the Irish land from the landlords to their tenants; the second was, that the Nationalists-for significantly enough it was under this name the Home Rulers described themselves during Parnell's leadership-should absolutely decline to accept office under the Imperial Government or to identify their fortunes with those of any English political party. As a Protestant, Parnell had no sympathy with the Catholics: as a landlord, he had no illusions on the subject of tenants: as a member of the dominant English caste, he had no love for the Celt: and as a gentleman born and bred, he entertained the ordinary sentiments of his class towards the clerks, shopkeepers, and reporters who made up the bulk of his Parliamentary following. He was, in fact, a dictator who ruled by sheer force of will, and his dictatorship broke down, because the priests distrusted him while the Nationalists resented his domination, and because both priests and Nationalists were only too glad to seize any opportunity for overthrowing and deserting the champion of the Home

The history of previous Home Rule agitations is, we repeat, well worth bearing in mind, when we are confronted with the

vague generalities by which Mr. Gladstone and the Liberals attempt to palliate their sudden desertion of the Union. We are asked to believe that Ireland has sustained such injuries on the part of England as to justify her in demanding to be released from British rule. As a matter of fact, we find that since the date when the Catholics were emancipated, England has been occupied year after year in redressing the real or alleged grievances of Ireland; till at last there is no tangible complaint left for her to make, except that union with England under a common Parliament is not in accordance with Nationalist aspirations. The injuries, therefore, which Ireland is supposed to have sustained must, in any case, date back to a bygone era. No doubt there were misgovernment, injustice, and oppression in the administration of Ireland up to the commencement of the century, now drawing to its close. But the other parts of the United Kingdom could, if needed, show that they too have at various times been misgoverned, oppressed, and treated with injustice. For such offences there must, in political even more than in legal affairs, be a statute of limitation. The one thing even Omnipotence cannot accomplish is to undo the past; and if the Penal Laws had been ten times as harsh and cruel as they were in reality, no atonement is possible for the wrongs which our forefathers may or may not have perpetrated on Ireland. The dead must bury the dead. Statesmen have to deal with the present, not with the past. When, therefore, we are told by a Minister, who by the way had lived to old age without ever discovering the magnitude and heinousness of our national guilt, that we are bound to repeal the Union because our ancestors ill-treated Ireland in the past, our answer must be that, even admitting the ill-treatment in the past, it affords no reason for the repeal of the Union in the present. It would be less illogical and absurd to argue that we ought to abandon all our Colonies in Africa because the negroes were, in times past, subjected by us to the horrors of the Slave Trade.

Again, we are told, by English Home Rulers, who take their cue from Mr. Gladstone, that the whole Irish question entered on a new departure when Ireland returned some fourscore Parliamentary representatives, pledged to support Mr. Parnell in his demand for Repeal. We are asked to admit that, in the face of such a manifestation of Irish national sentiment, further resistance on the part of England has become a moral impossibility. We are seriously asked to acknowledge that, in some form or other, Home Rule—or rather Repeal, which is only Home Rule writ large—has got to be conceded to Ireland as the logical consequence of the success of the

Parnellite-

Parnellite campaign. Our answer is obvious enough. If this were the first time that Ireland had asked for Home Rule. there might have been a certain prima facie force in the above argument. But, as a matter of fact, England has been repeatedly confronted before now with similar demands, put forward with equal or greater authority and acclaimed with equal or greater enthusiasm by the population of Ireland. Yet these Repeal agitations have proved one after the other to be hollow, hysterical, and without any real backbone. The Nationalist movement of to-day is, to say the least, not more formidable than those conducted under the leaderships of O'Connell, Butt, and Parnell. It follows by our past experience, that it will collapse after the fashion of its predecessors, either through the internal dissensions of its native leaders or through the return to office of an English Ministry pledged to uphold the Union and powerful enough to fulfil its pledges. Even spoilt children cease crying for the moon, when they realize that the moon lies beyond their parents' reach. The Irish will cease crying for Home Rule whenever they realize that to concede Home Rule is a thing beyond the power of any

English Minister or any English Party and the American party

There are many indications that the events of the last three months have gone far to bring home this conviction to the minds of the Irish Nationalists, or, at any rate, to those of their representatives in Parliament. Whatever may be the other deficiencies of the Irish character, slowness of perception is not to be numbered amongst them. And the Irish Members must be slowwitted indeed, if they fail to perceive that the Home Rule cause has lost ground ever since the Bill passed its second reading. When we last wrote on this subject, we entertained some doubt as to the expediency of fighting the Bill at all in Committee; and we still think that, if the Government had availed themselves of the opportunity afforded, they might have seriously impaired the strength of the Unionist position. If the Ministry had met the Opposition half-way, had accepted any amendments calculated to accentuate the nominal supremacy of the Imperial Parliament, and to provide paper guarantees for the better protection of the Protestant minority, they would, to a considerable extent, have cut the ground from under the feet of their opponents. It might, and would, have been alleged by Gladstonian candidates, with some plausibility, that the Government had met the reasonable requirements of the Unionists, and that the Bill, as amended, represented a fair compromise. The idea of settling any question on the principle of give and take, always commends itself to the ordinary British mind, and the commendation

commendation gains additional force when the question is one about which the British public is sick of hearing. Indeed, the advantages of the policy, the outlines of which we have suggested, are so obvious from a Home Rule point of view, that we cannot but think it would have been adopted if Mr. Parnell had been still alive and at the head of his party, and if Mr. Gladstone had had a free hand. The lost leader possessed the faculty, care amongst politicians, and rarest amongst those of Ireland, of seeing facts as they are. He would have realized at once that, if Ireland could only secure a Parliament and an Executive of her own, it was a matter of absolute unimportance what nominal restrictions were placed on their jurisdiction. He would, if we are not mistaken, have commanded his followers to acquiesce in any paper limitations, the imposition of which might render the British electorate less averse to the concession of Home Rule. But Alexander is dead, and Mr. Gladstone has to deal with Alexander's generals; and they, after the habit of their race and class, think of nothing except their own popularity and their individual ambitions. To refuse any concession, however valueless, demanded by the Unionists is certain to gratify popular Irish sentiment, and therefore the Sextons, and Healys, and Redmonds have yied with each other as to which shall show the most determined front in resisting any amendment which could possibly be regarded as a restriction on the competence of the Irish legislature. Mr. Gladstone has practically been given to understand, that any attempt to meet the Unionists half-way, even upon paper, would entail the loss of the Irish vote, and the consequent defeat of his Ministry. The dread of losing office, and losing it in all human likelihood for the last time, has been of itself sufficient to bring the Prime Minister to reason; moreover, it is only fair to admit, that Mr. Gladstone's personal vanity, and his exaggerated belief in his own popularity, may well have rendered him averse to any idea of a compromise, the acceptance of which might possibly deprive him of the credit of having carried the Home Rule Bill through Parliament by the force of his own unassisted efforts.

Anyhow, the danger we foresaw, or thought we foresaw, in the resolution of the Unionists to fight the Bill, clause by clause, line by line, and almost word by word, has not been realized. In politics, success is the chief test of merit, and we gladly admit that the event has justified the policy recommended by the Unionist leaders. Throughout the protracted debates in Committee, the Unionists have scored success after success, though they have been defeated by the steady vote of the Liberal-Nationalist coalition. It is too little to say they have had the

pest

best of the argument; we should be nearer the truth in saying they have had the whole of the argument. The Nationalists-have contributed nothing except noisy outbursts of ill-bred interruption. The Radicals, with rare exceptions, remained silent. The Gladstonians have contented themselves, whatever might be the question under discussion, with reiterating their implicit confidence in Mr. Gladstone. The duty of replying to the strictures of the Opposition has practically devolved on Mr. Gladstone, and even his Parliamentary ability has proved

unequal to such an arduous task.

A question may be raised as to the practical effect of these controversial successes. We do not believe ourselves, that speeches delivered in the House of Commons have any great effect on the electorate at large. Parliamentary harangues are, we suspect, less read now-a-days than they used to be; at all events, the classes by whom they are read are far less politically important than they were in the old days before the introduction of household suffrage; and the fact that the Opposition has had the best of the argument, is one that hardly comes home to the ordinary electoral intelligence. In much the same way, we greatly doubt whether the precise numbers polled for or against any amendment have much importance in so far as the general public is concerned. Whether the Ministerial majority is half-a-dozen votes more or less, is a matter to which the ordinary elector pays little attention, and to which he attaches still less interest. We may regret that this should be so, but our regret does not alter the fact that this is so. Still, while allowing this, we do not underrate the importance of the Unionists' campaign in the House of Commons. After all, the constituencies are largely influenced by the local agents of their parties; and these agents, in their turn, are greatly influenced by the opinions of their Parliamentary representatives. And we cannot doubt that the success, with which the Unionists have, time after time, proved their case up to the hilt in the Committee debates, has produced a very marked effect on many of the Gladstonian Liberals. Amongst the English Members of Parliament who have associated themselves with Mr. Gladstone's policy, there are a very considerable number who look on that policy with grave suspicion, if not with actual distrust. Party ties, party interests, party loyalty, will go a long way towards inducing even honest and sensible men to vote for a measure they disapprove of in their hearts, but they do not go far enough to render them indifferent to the possible consequences of their vote, when these consequences are brought clearly before their eyes. This is what the Unionists have done during

during the debates in Committee. They have opened the eyes of their opponents; and this process of awakening has led to a great searching of hearts amidst the Gladstonian following. One after another stray Gladstonian Liberals have come forward to protest that the measure of Home Rule they are called upon to support is not the measure they were led to believe they would be asked to support. In the case of one or two of these Liberal malcontents, personal motives may be thought to have contributed to their appreciation of the objections to Home Rule. Still, we cannot doubt that the few Gladstonians who have spoken out against the Bill represent a far larger number who have hitherto kept their disapproval to themselves. According to the calculation of one of the malcontents in question, there are at least thirty English and Scotch Liberals who would welcome any opportunity of giving the Bill its quietus, if they could do so without an open rupture with their party. Indeed, their hostility would long ago have assumed an active form, if it had not been for the conviction that the Bill, if passed, can never become law, as its rejection by the Lords is a matter of absolute certainty. The existence in the Liberal ranks of a body of men who would be glad to desert at the first plausible pretext, is an element of weakness in the Home Rule cause; the existence of this element has been brought to light by the vigour with which the defects of the Bill have been exposed in Committee; and the credit of this exposition is mainly due to Mr. Chamberlain,

The honours of the after Whitsuntide Session undoubtedly belong to the Liberal Unionist leader. In debating power, in clearness of statement, in vigour of attack and skill of defence, Mr. Chamberlain has proved himself more than a match for any speaker on the Liberal side, not excluding the Prime Minister himself. To detect the inconsistencies, anomalies, and absurdities of the Home Rule Bill, has been a work after his own heart; and the result of his investigation has been made known with an almost cruel lucidity. No doubt the strength of his case has made easier the work of a consummate advocate; but in addition, the marked contrast between Mr. Gladstone's involved sentences, ambiguous explanations, and irrelevant disquisitions. and Mr. Chamberlain's clear, plain, and simple style of oratory, has contributed in no small degree to the latter's success as a Parliamentary debater. People may dispute the soundness of Mr. Chamberlain's arguments, but everybody knows exactly what he means; his words are only capable of one, and that a straightforward explanation, and his oratory is always persuasive even when it is not absolutely conclusive. Granted

life and health, he stands clearly marked out as likely to attain to the highest rank of English statesmanship, though under what combination or what programme he may work his way to the front still remains doubtful. But the fact that a statesman with such a future before him, and with such a knowledge of English nature, should have gone out of his way to lead the campaign against Home Rule, speaks ill for the prospect of Repeal ever becoming a popular measure with the British public. During the period that preceded the late General Elections, the Gladstonians were never tired of announcing that, whatever happened, the Liberal Unionists would be wiped out, and that Mr. Chamberlain especially would be deprived of his influence, if not of his seat. Yet the Liberal Unionists, though slightly diminished in number, are as powerful in the present Parliament as they were in its predecessor, while Mr. Chamberlain has become a far more important political personage now than he ever was before. All this does not look as if Home Rule was the winning side.

Again, the present Session may be said to have witnessed the political resurrection of Lord Randolph Churchill. Inside the House, Mr. Chamberlain—and in a lesser degree Mr. Arthur Balfour-have taken the lead; but out of doors, it is the Member for Paddington who has taken the most conspicuous part in the campaign for the Union. Only a year ago it was the fashion, amidst the Liberals, to speak of Lord Randolph as a played-out politician, who, from whatever cause, was never likely to take again any active part in public life. But, during the last few months, he has been constantly before the public, addressing meeting after meeting in all the leading centres of political activity, and displaying once more the marvellous power of platform oratory, the exuberant energy, and the keen sympathy with popular sentiments and popular prejudices, which raised him to such high eminence, so gallantly won, so prematurely abandoned. That a singularly clear-sighted political observer, who has been content to remain so long in comparative obscurity, should consider that the campaign against Home Rule affords him a signal opportunity for recovering his past authority, is of ill-omen for the future of the Home Rule agitation.

It is also a bad sign for the prospects of Repeal that the Nationalists should take this opportunity of quarrelling among themselves. We once heard an old Irishwoman, who was descanting on her husband's misdoings, wind up her indictment of his failings by saying that he was one of God's own unaccountables. We have always thought that this description

applied

applied to the whole race to which the peccant husband belonged. There is something unaccountable—at any rate, to-English apprehension—about the doings of Irishmen. Still. after making allowance for this unknown and unknowable element of unaccountableness, it is difficult to believe that even Irishmen would not keep the peace amongst themselves if they believed they were on the eve of obtaining legislative independence. Under a native Parliament, every one of the leading members of the Nationalist party must expect—and most reasonably expect—to obtain posts of honour and emolument. In all the speeches and writings of their English allies, the Nationalists are assured that the concession of Home Ruleto Ireland is a mere question of months. Yet, when the prizelies, or is supposed to lie, almost within their grasp, Parnellites and Anti-Parnellites, Sextonites and Healyites, cannot keep peace with one another. The internal disputes between the directors of the 'Freeman's Journal' are dragged, without rhyme or reason, into the light of day, if not into the courts of law. The American public are called upon to decide between Parnellites and Anti-Parnellites as to the appropriation, or misappropriation, of the funds subscribed for the liberation of Ireland from Saxon rule. Mr. Sexton resigns his seat at the crisis of his country's fate, because he cannot put up with Mr. Timothy Healy, and then retracts his resignation assoon as his delicate sensibilities are satisfied with an indirect apology. The Irish clergy and the Irish patriots rush intoprint to complain of clerical dictation on the one hand, or want of respect for the authority of the Church on the other; and Mr. Morrogh announces that the protection of his commercial interests in South Africa is more important than the redemption of his country from her hereditary bondage, and that in consequence he shall retire from public life. If the Nationalists, in fact, had wished to furnish an object-lesson of what Home Rule means in practice, and not in theory, they could hardly have devised a better method than by washing their dirty linen-and the linen, it must be avowed, is dirtyin public. This explanation, however, is inadmissible, and we can only account for the outburst of Hibernian discord on one of two hypotheses. The first is, that the Nationalists believe the battle is won; that they are absolute masters of the situation, owing to their command of Mr. Gladstone and the Liberals; and that there is therefore no further necessity for keeping up the farce of their being single-hearted patriots and ardent constitutionalists, whose only aim is to provide for the welfare of their country and to protect the rights and liberties of their fellowcountrymen,

countrymen, irrespective of race, or class, or creed. The other and more plausible hypothesis is, that they know the game is lost, and that, like rats, they are anxious to scuttle from the sinking ship. Even if Home Rule is dropped for the present, patriotism will still continue to be a paying business in Ireland. After all, for the bulk of the Nationalists, agitation is their profession and livelihood; and it is easy to understand why, if the coalition between the Nationalists and the English Liberals is regarded as doomed to end in a discreditable fiasco, the former should be struggling with each other to vindicate their pretension to be regarded as the real Simon Pures, the genuine representatives of the Nationalist cause, the true successors and

heirs of the uncrowned king.

But the strongest à priori evidence as to the impending collapse of Home Rule is to be found in the attitude of the Ministerialist Liberals and in the methods their leaders have adopted in order to carry out their policy. The attitude of the party, as distinguished from that of its leaders, has been one of masterly inactivity. Throughout the long and weary debates in Committee, the non-official Gladstonians have, with rare and undistinguished exceptions, taken no part whatever in the discussion. They have voted straight and voted solid, but having done their duty as items, they have manifested an undisguised reluctance to commit themselves to any outspoken approval of the Ministerial measure, or to identify themselves with its fortunes, one whit beyond what was required by the rules of party allegiance. When a popular reform is being carried through Parliament, the minor members of the party in favour of the reform in question are only too anxious to seize any opportunity of expressing their heartfelt sympathy with the cause, and thus securing to themselves some portion of the prestige attending its enactment. But in the present instance, pre-eminence of any kind in the advocacy, or even the endorsement of the measure that is to replace the Act of Union by a 'Union of hearts,' is not found to be a coveted distinction. It may be said that the word of command to the rank and file of the Gladstonian party has been to take as little part as possible in the debates in Committee in order to facilitate the passing of the Bill. If so, the command has been obeyed with suspicious alacrity, but, even if this is so, there was nothing to prevent the Gladstonian members from holding meetings in their constituencies, to advocate the merits of the Home Rule Bill, which in Mr. Gladstone's opinion is to be the great triumph of his lifetime, the grandest achievement of Liberal legislation during the present Vol. 177.—No. 353. century. century. Yet, while the Unionists are holding meeting after meeting throughout the country, the Gladstonians studiously avoid any opportunity of addressing their constituents, and fight shy of any proposal to assist in public demonstrations in favour of the Bill. The inference is obvious. They hold aloof because they have no wish to assume the responsibility of the measure one inch further than they are compelled to do by the exigencies of their position. When Queen Joan of Naples strangled her husband, she is said to have called out to her fellow-conspirators, 'Gentlemen, you must all take hold of the rope.' In like fashion, the Gladstonian Liberals are bidden to take hold of the rope which is to strangle the Empire, but the bulk of them touch it as lightly and as gingerly as they can, in order to be able to plead hereafter that their tension did

not really contribute to the perpetration of the crime.

Even the Ministers as a body have not displayed that desire to take a prominent part in the advocacy of the Bill which might have been expected from men engaged in an historic enterprise. Strictly speaking, the Peers have as yet had nothing to do with the Home Rule controversy, but still the members of the Cabinet who sit in the House of Lords might, if they had been so minded, have found frequent opportunities during the last few months of expressing their sympathy with the Bill, their confidence in its efficacy, and their belief in its success. Yet their appearances in public have, like angels' visits, been rare and far between. Neither Lord Herschell nor Lord Rosebery, nor the Marquis of Ripon, nor Lord Kimberley, nor even Earl Spencer, has given utterance to anything but the barest and most meagre approval of the general principle of Home Rule. Nor has the support of the Bill from the Members of the Cabinet in the Commons been much more hearty or more enthusiastic. The comparative silence of Mr. Asquith, Mr. Fowler, Mr. Mundella, Mr. Acland, Sir George Trevelyan, and Mr. Shaw Lefevre, may possibly be accounted for by other considerations than any reluctance on their part to place themselves in evidence; still, however this may be, the defence of the Bill has devolved almost exclusively on Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Morley, Mr. Bryce, and the Solicitor-General, while even the support given by Sir William Harcourt, the deputy-leader of the party, has been tame and moderate in comparison with his usual style and tone of Parliamentary advocacy. The mode in which the Prime Minister has conducted the defence of his measure has not been that of an advocate who knows he has a winning case. When a skilled counsel tries to avoid the real issues, to confuse the jury by the introduction of irrelevant considerations, to raise technical objections and to evade meeting the arguments adduced against his client's contentions, no great amount of legal experience is required to show that he does not expect to win the case, if at all, upon its intrinsic merits. Mr. Gladstone, whatever estimate may be placed upon his statesmanship, is a past-master of Parliamentary tactics; and if he had felt any confidence in the success of his measure, he would-so we imagine—have adopted very different tactics. His whole energies and his inexhaustible ingenuity have been devoted to concealing the true character of his Bill, to misrepresenting the arguments adduced against it, and to snatching a verdict, if possible, upon a side issue. We are forced to the conclusion, either that Mr. Gladstone's Parliamentary hand has lost its cunning, or that no other line of advocacy was open to him in accordance with the instructions under which he was bound to act. It would be an insult to his understanding to suppose that he believes seriously in the gloss he has placed in his recent correspondence with the Duke of Devonshire, on the appeal he made to the constituencies in 1885, to return him a sufficient majority to enable him to legislate for Ireland, independent of the Irish vote. The plain truth is, he is now absolutely dependent upon the Irish vote, and has yielded to the temptation which he himself foresaw in a lucid moment would prove fatal to his own political integrity.

We believe ourselves that whenever the 'history of our own times' is written from an impartial point of view, not from that of a Home Rule partisan, it will be found that from the outset of the negociations between Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Parnell, the latter insisted on absolute legislative independence being conferred on Ireland as the price of the Irish vote, of which, at that time, he had complete control. Mr. Gladstone was well aware that any overt acquiescence in these conditions would alienate the support of the English Liberals, and it was on this account that throughout the six years during which the Unionist Government remained in office, he steadily refused to explain the nature of the Bill by which he professed to be able to reconcile the concession of autonomy to Ireland, with the maintenance of the supremacy of the Imperial Parliament. We do not say-we have no right to say-that Mr. Parnell's obstinacy was the reason why he was sacrificed to the demands of the Nonconformist conscience. But we do say that Mr. Gladstone's sudden discovery of the heinousness of Mr. Parnell's violation of the Seventh Commandment was probably stimulated by a conviction that Mr. Parnell's ostracism from public life might facilitate the acceptance of a compromise on the part of the Nationalists which would be less distasteful to the English Gladstonians. Unfortunately or fortunately, as we may choose to think, the result of the General Election of 1892 rendered the Nationalist vote even more important to the Liberals than it had been while they remained in Opposition. To forego the chance of a return to office was more than Mr. Gladstone could contemplate with equanimity, and therefore he consented, consciously or unconsciously, to accept the terms upon which the support of the Nationalist vote was made conditional. As these terms could not be communicated to the public, his whole energies were devoted to inducing Parliament to take a leap in the dark. During the debates on the second reading, any inconvenient question was met by the statement that all points in dispute would be discussed and explained in Committee. When the Bill reached the Committee stage, the same system of evasion and postponement was followed up with perverted ingenuity. In principle Mr. Gladstone always declared himself favourable to any amendment which affirmed the supremacy of the Imperial Parliament; in practice, he as uniformly opposed any amendment which tended to accentuate the subordinate character of the Irish Parliament. Whenever it came to a division, his subservient followers voted against any proposal which was inconsistent with the terms of the unwritten compact concluded between their leader and their Nationalist allies. Had it not been for the objections raised by the Irish, Mr. Gladstone would doubtless have allowed the Unionists to bring forward any number of amendments on the principle of the Bargee-who allowed his wife to beat him. saying that 'it amuses her and does not hurt me.' When, however, it became apparent that the persistent criticism of the Bill, as conducted by the Opposition, constituted a real danger to the passing of the Bill through the House of Commons, Mr. Gladstone made the discovery that the conduct of the Unionists was factious and must be suppressed by the closure. We have no doubt the gagging order was issued reluctantly. No statesman whose whole public life has, for threescore years, been passed in the House of Commons-whose reputation has been earned in that great Assembly-whose highest pride is that he has been time after time, and is still, in spite of his eighty odd years, Prime Minister of England, could ever have consented with 'a light heart' to curtail the authority of the mother of Parliaments. To do Mr. Gladstone justice, he struggled as long as he could against the orders of his Irish taskmasters; but in the end he had to give way, as we all of us have to do when once we have got into the position of Sindbad. Sindbad, and our shoulders are bestridden by some old man of the mountain. It does not suit the interests of the Nationalist cause to have the Home Rule Bill thrown over for another year. At the rate the Bill was making—or failing to make progress, it had become evident there was no chance of its getting through Committee in time to be sent up to the Lords this Session. The Irish insisted that, under these circumstances, force must be applied to cut down the debates; and as

usual, Mr. Gladstone gave way.

At the date at which we write, it is impossible to foresee exactly how the guillotine process will work. Even with good will on both sides, it is difficult to see how there could be anything like adequate discussion within the narrow limits prescribed by the 'legislation by compartment' system. To make a brand new Constitution is a hard task enough, but it is a mere trifle compared with that of adapting a new written Constitution to an old unwritten Constitution, based upon usage and precedent and the Common Law. Yet the House is asked to scurry through this work of Constitution-tinkering at railway The question whether the Irish Parliament is to consist of two Chambers or one; what, in the event of there being an Upper House, is to be its composition—what are to be the powers and position of the Lord Lieutenant, and under what conditions his right of veto is to be exercised—are only a few of the complicated issues to be decided in the first week of the closure period. All these issues bear directly on a variety of aggravating topics, and are certain to excite any amount of Yet the Government solemnly profess to believe that a week-which in the Parliamentary calendar means four night sittings and half a day's sitting—is sufficient for an exhaustive discussion. Of course, if the Opposition choose to play into the Government's hands, the work might be scampered through after a fashion, by allotting to each clause, each section, and each amendment, a fixed proportion of the some fifty hours, to which, by the will of the majority, the debate is to be restricted. But the snare is set in vain in sight of the bird; and we cannot imagine the Unionists will play up to Mr. Gladstone's lead. There are cases in which no bread is better than half a loaf; and the present is one. It is far better for the country that clauses, such as those we have specified, should be passed without a word being said for or against them, than that they should be passed after a brief debate, during which it would be manifestly impossible to bring to light their merits or demerits. The tactics, therefore, of the Opposition are marked out. They will refuse to be parties to an illusory discussion;

they will go on debating each clause, section, sub-section, and amendment as fully and as carefully as if they still enjoyed freedom of debate; and thus when the hour comes for the closure to be imposed in accordance with the Gladstonian timetable, there will be a number of clauses of vital importance that will have to be passed by a virtual show of hands, without the slightest discussion or examination. Legislation of such a kind on such a subject would be a distinct scandal; and the Ministry will be forced either to abandon their Procrustean policy or to furnish the Lords with a perfectly valid excuse for throwing out the Bill almost without a hearing, on the ground that its most important clauses had been forced in silence through the House of Commons, without any discussion being allowed.

The dilemma in which the Ministry will be placed by the necessary and almost automatic operation of the summary closure system, can hardly have escaped their observation. Indeed, the result of their tactics is so obvious, that, in the opinion of many shrewd observers, the Ministry are deliberately courting defeat, or, in sporting phrase, are riding for a fall. According to this theory, Mr. Gladstone will announce at no very distant date that, owing to the (as he considers) factious opposition his Home Rule Bill has encountered, it is impossible to pass it in a shape which will secure respectful treatment at the hands of the Lords and command the confidence of the country. The fundamental principles of Home Rule have, he will allege, been established by a series of decisive votes, and will, he will declare, be endorsed by the country with such an expression of popular opinion as will leave no room for further doubt as to his policy having met with the approval of the constituencies. On the strength of these assumptions he will announce his intention of withdrawing the Bill and recommending the dissolution of Parliament as soon as certain measures-such as the Parish Councils Bill, the Registration Reform Bill, and the One Man One Vote Bill—have been passed by the present Parliament. The tactical advantages of such a course are obvious. No immediate dissolution would be required, and the Liberals would, in all likelihood, secure at least another year of office. The Unionists would be placed under the difficulty of either having to oppose legislation-not directly connected with the Home Rule controversy-which would certainly be popular with large masses of the electorate, or of accepting this legislation, and thereby strengthening the hands of the Separatists at the next General Election. Lastly, if the Upper House threw out the Bills above referred to, which, logically, they would be bound to do, it would be easy to raise an outcry that the Lords were opposing the rights of the people: a cry which it is impossible to raise with effect so long as the Lords only insist upon the right of the people to be consulted before Home Rule is made the law of the land. Indeed, we find it difficult to believe that the arguments in favour of such a course as we have indicated have not suggested themselves to some of the less enthusiastic members of the Ministry, and may possibly have induced them to consent to the perilous experiment of trying to force the Home Rule Bill through the House of Commons, by the application of the closure, enforced as it must be by the votes of a narrow and uncertain majority. There are, however, two reasons why we should be induced to think that this line of action would not meet with Mr. Gladstone's approval. The first is that the withdrawal of the Bill would be bitterly resented by the Nationalists, and would probably be denounced as a betraval of their confidence. The second is that its withdrawal, however it might be defended as a matter of tactics. would be a confession of failure; and such a confession is one the Prime Minister would never make except under absolute compulsion. Moreover, however great may be his vitality and energy, no statesman, at his time of life, can reckon on being able to undergo, a year hence, the strain and effort he has undergone during the last six months. Nobody realizes more fully than he does himself the fact that it is he, and he alone, who has carried Home Rule so far on the road to success. He knows perfectly well that, if failing health or advance of years should incapacitate him from conducting the Home Rule campaign in person, the whole agitation would collapse; and that his memory, instead of being associated with an act of great constructive statesmanship, as the Repeal of the Union is in his opinion, would be identified with a signal legislative failure. To speak the plain truth, a Prime Minister, in his eighty-fourth year, cannot afford to play a waiting game. Our own idea, therefore, is that Mr. Gladstone will fight out the battle to the end, under the belief that, when the Bill is rejected by the House of Lords, his own personal popularity and prestige will enable him to secure the return of a fresh and increased majority, pledged to support the concession of Home Rule.

In as far as the Unionists are concerned, it matters comparatively little whether the Bill does or does not go up to the Lords this Session. In either case their course is clear. They have got to impress upon the constituencies the fact that under the Bill, as it stands, or as long as it is based on the same principles, the vital interests of Great Britain, and still more, of England, are being deliberately sacrificed to the necessity of

securing

securing a Liberal majority by the aid of the Nationalist vote. England, by a majority of its representatives, has declared against Home Rule; yet the vote of England has not only been overpowered, but the voice of her representatives has been silenced by the unscrupulous exercise of a power granted to the Parliamentary majority of the day under completely other conditions and for distinctly other purposes. The closure was established to baffle the persistent attempts of the Parnellite Party to render Parliamentary legislation an impossibility, so long as that legislation was designed to check the crimes and punish the outrages to which the leaders of the Land League movement consciously or unconsciously owed their power. To say that such a remedy is applicable to curtail the legitimate discussion of the gravest constitutional changes, is an attempt to impose upon the credulity of the public. The Unionists, therefore, have got to show that in fighting against the Home Rule Bill, they are fighting for the rights and privileges of the English people. They have got, too, to bring home the fact that under the 'Union of hearts,' the Irish, while possessing absolute independence in legislating about Irish affairs, will remain at liberty to determine the policy and direct the administration of England. In Great Britain, the strength of the Liberal and Conservative parties is pretty evenly matched, and it is not probable that for some time to come their respective proportions can be so altered as to give one party any indisputable supremacy over the other. Yet, so long as this is the case, the Nationalists, who under Home Rule will be the delegates of the Irish Parliament, will remain supreme at Westminster. Their vote will decide which of the two parties is to hold office in England, and their vote will naturally be given to whichever of these two parties bids highest in the shape of concessions and subsidies. In other and plainer words, the Liberals will retain, or at any rate will hope to retain, the control of English affairs by conceding to the Irish any modification of or addition to the terms of the Home Rule compact, which they may insist upon as the price of their continued support.

It would be doing less than justice to the good sense and public spirit of England to suppose that, if these facts could be made manifest, the great mass of the electorate, whatever their politics might be, would not vote against a policy so injurious

and even fatal to the welfare of our country.

QUARTERLY REVIEW.

ART. I.—1. The World's Columbian Exposition, Official Guide. Chicago, 1893.

 The Daily News Almanac and Political Register. Chicago, 1893.

3. The American Commonwealth. By James Bryce, M.P. Second Edition. London, 1893.

 The Principles of Ethics. Vol. II. By Herbert Spencer. London, 1893.

 Sur l'Ínégalité des Races humaines. Par M. le Comte de Gobineau. Deuxième Édition. Paris, 1884.

THE New Zealander, who figures in Macaulay's famous sentence, was undoubtedly an artist, but need not have been a philosopher. In sketching the ruins of St. Paul's from his broken arch, he would only be imitating the many travellers enamoured of the picturesque and the dead past, who have stood among the ruins of Babylon or the hundred-gated Thebes, or the historians, like Gibbon, whose fancy has been kindled by hearing the barefooted friars of St. Francis singing vespers in the temple of Jupiter. Yet a still more interesting tourist would he have been, to whom the future rather than the past was an incitement of travel in ancient days. Much we would give for the sketch of the low hills and marshes on which London now stands, had Cæsar inserted one in his description of Britain. And Germanicus, sailing by the desolate swamps where centuries later Antwerp or Amsterdam was to be the centre of medieval traffic or of that world-commerce which swept into its net the products of the Indian Archipelago, might have enabled us to see with Roman eyes the cradle of a time so foreign to all his anticipations. We still read with eagerness and curiosity the half lines or distant and obscure Vol. 177.-No. 354.

hints which tell us but too little of the names and places, most barbarous as they sound in that imperial language, that to the Roman of the age of Tacitus represented the ends of the earth, lying far beyond his civilized and pacific world. How amazed would he have been, had any vision revealed to him that descendants of these barbarians would hold sovereign sway over more than one continent when Rome was but the 'lone Mother of dead Empires'; and that new nations, languages, literatures, political systems, and methods of commerce, -all, indeed, bearing traces of the Latin laws and influence, yet on the whole original and ever becoming less like unto the things he knew, - were to spread over the world, from the desolate Lower Rhine and the marshes of the Thames! But neither Virgil, Tacitus, nor Pliny, had any insight which connected our Britain with the civilization they prized. History alone has divulged the secret 'Imperatorem posse fieri alibi quam Romæ.' And we may suppose that a Rip Van Winkle, or sleeper of Ephesus, could such have survived from the first century, and now awake to traverse modern Europe, would be utterly at a loss to conjecture how from nomads of so rude a type as the kindred of Arminius or the painted Britons, a great and flourishing commonwealth of nations should have arisen, with ideals and laws which he could not deny to be superior to his own.

But London, Antwerp, Amsterdam, have behind them the record of many eventful years; and a fresh New World is springing up under conditions as unlike those which made these great cities flourish, as the cities themselves are unlike conquering Rome. That sense of amazement which should have taken captive Cæsar and Germanicus, -who that will reflect with the open page of history before him can escape it when travelling in America? He knows that Europe is covered with the ruins of vanquished nations, of reformed religions, and of dynasties overturned by revolution. In America, the only ruins are those which amid the forests of Yucatan, or in other spots as remote from the press and hurry of business, announce that some uncultivated race of Indians once made a beginning of architecture which they never followed up. The drift and detritus of every nation have been floated on these hospitable shores. But no historic past accuses the present of injustice. The antiquarian temper finds little on which to feed; and those who would philosophize are led as by an instinct to prophesy. They see a new order of things on the largest scale ever attempted. Will it turn out to be a New Jerusalem, or only an unfinished Tower of Babel? The hopes of mankind are centred upon the mighty enterprise. And, as ever, while the pessimist declares with the Count de Gobineau that from the offscouring of spent and degenerate tribes, such as Europe is casting by the half-million upon American soil, nothing can ensue but a 'horrible mixture' and a constantly declining average of morality, art, and political wisdom, there are optimists (among whom we may reckon Mr. Bryce and Mr. Payne) to whom it appears that Democracy will hasten the Golden Age, and the future of the New World as much exceed our past in Europe, as that in many respects has been an advance upon the classic, and a testimony to the

law of human progress.

et

he

h.

ed

n-

re

of

s,

le

ie

e

r

d

Such, truly, are the questions to which Chicago and its Exposition give rise; and they will interest the philosophic observer when the tens of thousands who have idly wandered through Jackson Park, and amused themselves in the Midway Plaisance, are gone home again, carrying with them a confused picture of the World's Fair. The patriotic American will have dwelt with pride on the gigantic buildings, broad and busy streets, leagues of boulevards, and thousands of miles of railway, which entitle Chicago to call itself the seventh largest city now extant on this planet. He will have dazzled his foreign visitor with statistics, each column outdoing the one before it, until a nightmare of facts and figures threatens to overwhelm the imagination they were intended to stimulate. This 'colossal Manchester,' whose warehouses, higher than the London Monument, are crowded within the busiest half-mile on the earth's surface,—this Rotterdam on the shores of Lake Michigan, with its twenty-two miles of frontage to the sea and its forty-one miles on the grimy banks of the Chicago River; with its sixty bridges, its thirty-five trunk-lines of railroad, its tonnage rivalling that of New York, and half as much as that of London,—this largest market in the world for cereals and stock, which exchanges the products of the whole East with those of the whole West, is essentially American. It is aptly summed up in the three immense halls of transportation, machinery, and electric appliances, which cover so many acres of the Exhibition. For Chicago represents the Industrial Era without tradition, history, or a system of hierarchical government to temper its rule. Science gives the methods, and Industrialism the ends, to which its incalculable resources are directed and by which they go on increasing. If London is the fitting emblem of a time when British commerce followed the expansion of the British Empire, Chicago may be said to lay at the feet of Democracy all that science can extract from the mines, or can raise in the fields which its methods are subduing. It is a part of the American story which has been long in preparation, but which was sure one day to be realized, and with it, in one shape or another, the future of the world is bound up. For men have been slowly passing from the ancient, or Greek and Roman idea of property, which, as McCulloch well observes, was 'spoil, whether acquired by land or sea,' to the industrial, wherein all property is the fruit of labour. And somewhere on the American continent, this, which may be called the genuine economic view as opposed to the predatory and the feudal, was destined to be translated into a political and social order of things, the aim of which, to quote Mr. Herbert Spencer, should be 'the securing to each citizen all such beneficial results of his activities as his activities naturally

bring.'

'Aller Anfang ist schwer,' said Goethe; and, surprising as may be the outward aspects of Chicago, which do but express its sudden and unprecedented rise to commercial greatness, the beginnings of an economic Utopia will not perhaps be so easily perceived in the throng of its markets, the fierce competition for employment in its streets, or the somewhat trivial luxury of the mansions which stand conspicuous on Lake Shore and in the precincts of Lincoln Park. M. de Gobineau, whom we have cited for his strong feudal prejudices, and whose volumes, full of curious speculations, were written to show that blood is everything and environment of little consequence provided the superior race keeps itself pure, would ask scornfully whether the refuse and runaways of twenty-five nations are the material from which to make a new heaven and a new earth? This crowd of fifteen hundred thousand human beings, which in a few years has built up a London in the State of Illinois, will, it seems likely, go on doubling until it has spread far beyond the limits of the one hundred and eighty square miles now mapped out as the city of Chicago. The confusion of tongues will be perpetuated so long as Germans, Norsemen, Swedes, Poles, Bohemians, Russians, Greeks, and Mongolians, press in with all the varieties which the British Islands have sent forth, to snatch at the advantages offered by what will surely become the greatest centre of exchange in kind, if not in money, which the world has ever seen. Already the native Americans in this gathering of the peoples are but a fourth, or even less than a fourth, of the whole number. It is a cosmopolitan city which has sprung up in the wilderness within the last twenty or twenty-five years, and, like Rome under the Emperors, it receives good and bad from every quarter, asking

them no questions, and leaving them to struggle for existence according to the law which Mr. Sumner has expressed, that 'the supreme result of modern society is to guarantee to every man the use of all his powers exclusively for his own benefit.' That has been repeatedly announced as the true American idea of Democracy, according to which the individual exercises his right to 'life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness' in whatever fashion may approve itself to his conscience and

judgment.

Little were these things foreseen by the first explorers,-Joliet the soldier and Marquette the priest,-who in 1673 wandered over this unhealthy and savage region, then the hunting-ground of tribes which, whether they might have been tamed or no by gentle treatment, have long since vanished before the strong and not always scrupulous white man. Dearborn Street, extending for many miles across the city, recalls the name of a military station and the memory of a massacre by Indians in 1812. Illinois was admitted as a State of the Union in 1818; but for many years it seemed probable that Milwaukee, ninety miles above Chicago, on the western shore of Lake Michigan, would be the centre of intercourse between the unsettled Far West, the Canadas, and the Atlantic seaboard. The first census of Chicago, taken fifty-three years ago, showed a population of less than five thousand souls. The total value of its real estate was estimated below a hundred thousand But by December 1853, the number of its people had reached nearly sixty thousand; and, growing every year, it had in May 1888 become eight hundred thousand, which we may reckon has almost doubled at the time we are writing. In equal, or greater proportion, has the value of taxable (and still more of untaxed) property increased. In 1891 it attained the magnificent figure of two hundred and fifty-six million dollars, or two-and-seventy times the amount of real estate set down by the collectors of the year 1840. To break up these unimaginable sums into their details would involve nothing less than a picture by sections of the streets, warehouses, banks, private dwellings, public edifices, and means of transit, the ten thousand particulars, in short, which leave the visitor to Chicago impressed, as in no European city save London, with a sense of its incessant activity and the endless heaping up of wealth which goes on within its borders. New York has its own remarkable phenomena to show; but they are more scattered, and the effect on the imagination is not so deep. Chicago remains under every change of incident, a gigantic emporium, soon to be the business centre of the New World, and the place to which all lines of import and export converge as by

And such a law we find in its situation. It rivals Constantinople, not in beauty,-for how could a monotonous, rectangular city, built on a hopelessly level plain, and rescued from the slime of Lake Michigan, appear beautiful?—but in the happy command of landways and waterways which, as soon as the railroad system was sufficiently developed, have shown it to be the only possible meeting-place of American commerce. Lake Michigan, dividing East from West by its whole length, directs the vast inland traffic round by its southern shore, out of whose miry clay Chicago has been created. Between the fresh-water seas and the Atlantic on one side, and the iron roads of the Central States on the other, stands the great city, holding out its hands to the rising and the setting sun, connecting the trade of the eastern and western seaboard, and already glancing towards China, Japan, and Australia in its resolve to become the permanent capital of the New Hemisphere. Its inhabitants, a little given to boasting perhaps, are not unwilling to taunt New York as their future seaport,-it is to play the part of a Liverpool, as they say, to their London. The prairie and the lake have thus made the unrivalled opportunities of Chicago. What, however, would its natural advantages have availed in the hands of the Red Indians, or even of the Spaniards or the French? None but a long-headed, persevering, and scientific people like the Americans could build up by means of steel girders and cement, on a foundation of soft clay, the portentous though unlovely city which has defied storms and fire to overwhelm it and grows with every disaster. From the East have come the men, with their energy and their capital, their love of detail and their large and adventurous combinations, to whom both its greatness and its narrowness are owing. The twenty-five nations of emigrants may have furnished human material, not quite unlike the mud foundations on which it is erected, if we take them at their worst. But in the expansion and the triumph of this most modern town, we shall do well to remember that Puritan shrewdness and habits of industry, although now divorced from Puritan religion, are the factors which have told, binding the various systems of rail, lake, river, and ocean, into a network so vast that we may predict a future for the Garden City which not even London can eclipse. It is, we say, the meeting-place of East, West, and Centre, with the Continents of the Pacific for a background that is yearly becoming less distant. Already the worldcommerce is beginning to unload itself on the shores of Lake Michigan.

Michigan. The age of steam and iron made London and New York. The age of electricity will see Chicago contending with them for the crown of commerce.

But if all knowledge is born of comparison, much more so is the moral estimate of things; and the moral estimate is, at last, When the scholar, as Americans love to call the human. him, walks about Chicago, and goes round her, and tells the towers thereof, when he marks well her foundations and considers her palaces, he cannot help evoking the memories of another, and an Old-World system of commerce—the Greece of two thousand three hundred years ago, which was busy, rapid, and enterprising on its own scale, but instinct with ideals of beauty and of light. He is convinced that such alone is the true standard of judgment; and in the view of the Union stockyards, and the tall, three-cornered Masonic temple, and the great Auditorium, and the scores of iron cages soaring skywards in which Chicago transacts its daily business, he asks himself, 'Shall we talk of progress any more? Is it possible to set this amazing mass of steel and stone, these broadways fretted with iron lines, and these dust-choked thoroughfares, in one picture with Athens, Rhodes, Syracuse, and the hundred Hellenic cities of which the very name is music? Could a Greek of the temper Pericles would have praised, spend his life in the commerce which is here practised? Or is the multiplication of exchanges civilization? What are the aims of Greek culture to Chicago? And how can that which is more venerable even than the learning of Hellas, the Christian religion itself, survive amid an undisguised pursuit of wealth for its own sake-of money which does but produce a still greater heap of money, and which has healed the vice of poverty as we know it in the Old World, by putting in its stead the vice of sordid covetousness, now exalted above all gods in the New?'

Perhaps the Exposition now drawing to a close was intended by American patriots to indicate their reply to such questionings, in which their friends and critics from Europe have by no means a monopoly. There are native thinkers who would be among the first to mark, even with some humorous laying on of colour, the perils which environ 'unexampled prosperity' like that of Chicago. But, while paying due deference to the scholar's reading in Aristotle and Thucydides, his courteous entertainers would remind their guest of the new and strange circumstances of the case, to which neither Athens nor Sparta, nor the Greek colonizing in Sicily or the Roman in Gaul, may furnish a parallel. The democracies of the ancient world

world had their origin, no doubt, in revolution; and thus far, the United States resemble them; but they were set up and continued to flourish upon the foundation of religious unity, and on the slavery of those who would now be termed the working classes. The right of citizenship depending on blood relation was jealously guarded even in liberal Athens. So, too, the 'indigenous altar' of Apollo Archegetes-who, through his oracle at Delphi, had directed the Hellenic emigrants to make their home in Sicily-long remained an object of veneration to all the Greeks of the island, symbolizing a community of beliefs and practices which no individual would have dared And the first Sicilian polities were oligarchical in a high degree, not unlike those settlements of the Puritans among the Indian tribes which, from the nature of the case, obliged all their members to look upon one another as belonging to the same clan, while intermarriage with the natives would have appeared in their eyes a crime against the State no less than against religion. But the problem of American progress has now become the problem of selfgovernment, without an established Church, or a servile class, or Spartan decrees forbidding strangers to settle in the midst of the citizens, or notable families trained to power and office, or inherited rank and title to designate those who should take upon themselves the administration of affairs. No provision whatever is made in church or school for carrying on the government of the country. There is neither a military, nor an aristocratic, nor an official caste, such as in the Greek cities would look on the emoluments and spoils of the State as its peculiar appanage. Instead of thousands of slaves, we see millions of voters. So that their enemies might define the American institutions as a recognized anarchy, with universal suffrage to make it perpetual.

But surely they would be deceiving themselves with a vain sound. Anarchy, whatever its derivation, implies to modern ears disorder, violence, and the reign of brute force. But we have only to travel on the cars along State Street or Michigan Avenue, and we shall begin to understand that self-government is none of these things. Admire as we may the monarchy around which loyal associations cluster in England, or the brilliant show and stir of military France, or even the barrack system that has made of Germany a second Sparta, we must still confess that the million and a half who are engaged in these gigantic produce and exchange markets, have found out how to keep the peace, to stand by their innumerable contracts, and to pursue their varied aims without quarrelling, although not a soldier is

visible in the compass of their city, and a mere handful of police-some two thousand all told-suffice to guard these endless thoroughfares. The instinct of order is clearly strong enough to dispense with a ruling caste. And as we see the Pax Americana binding in its golden chains these motley tribes about the shores of the Great Lake, so we may journey under its protection from Maine to Oregon, and as far down South as the nation is at all populous and settled. Nor do isolated acts of lawlessness prove the contrary. But perhaps tourists are slow to bear in mind that if Europe were, what America has been these hundred years, a confederacy of States possessing Home Rule, with an elective Government throughout, and merely a Federal executive as the bond of union, it would be matter for the heartiest congratulation if the peace were kept from Edinburgh to Athens without an armed force, and deeds of outrage or highway robbery were reported only from the borders of Transylvania or the steppes of Russia.

The American Government has struck out a new line in It is the very opposite of the paternal and the oligarchical. While reproducing, but on a scale commensurate with the continent which it occupies, the multiplied cities, states, and alliances that make the story of the Greeks so interesting and so complicated, still it aims at nothing less than to carry into effect the idea of freedom until it has penetrated into every form of human life. A nation, in the English or French meaning of the word, America is not, and does not desire to be. Neither is it moving on towards a centralized Government, or a personal tyranny, or the disruption of its several parts. The Constitution, which is to all citizens an object not only of reverence but of enthusiasm, leaves ample room for the States to develop in their own way and to make experiments in schemes of taxation and franchise; nor can the central Power interfere except after process of law and on well-ascertained precedents. With us, the Parliament is the assembled nation, and its jurisdiction is unbounded. In a single session it may reform or revolutionize laws which in their very wording are declared to be fundamental. But in America, President, Senate, and House of Representatives together, do not exercise this sovereign sway. They can but propose to amend some part of the Great Charter of Independence; and if the country is unwilling to vote, the matter drops, and there is an end. For these high purposes, the people are their own representatives, appointing no delegates and under no circumstances surrendering their authority to another. It is not simply that a king does not rule them; just as little as a king does Congress

make laws for which it has not received a mandate. The French system of imperious and domineering officials, who hold the popular sovereignty in commission, would be as speedily cast aside by the American democrat as the Junkerthum of Prussia. He looks upon the Legislature and the Executive, not in the light of masters whom he has put on his back that they may ride him, but in that of servants who are to do as he bids.

And this idea of the sovereign individual employing, in free conjunction with his fellow-citizens, the social forms which he can modify at pleasure, instead of being employed and moulded by them, runs through American society from end to end. We Europeans, who have inherited so much else from Greeks and Hebrews, from Romans and Germans, are naturally disposed to use the language of Aristotle's 'Politics' or Plato's 'Republic' when discussing the formation of the social order. In such language there lies embedded a deep distinction between the governing and the governed, between individuals set by nature at the top and the multitude of serfs or subjects who form the base of the pyramid which rises over them. But the originality of the American mind is shown precisely at this point, where it differs as much, to say the least, from the French with their bureaucracy and their despotism, as it does from the conservative and monarchical English. In all these varieties of government, it has been constantly supposed that the small number who held political office were not only authorized but required to see to it that a given ideal should be realized among the people. They have been looked upon as creators of a definite type of education, of religious training or artistic culture, or of military and physical discipline,—as charged with the responsibility of the nation in much the same sense as a father is charged with the proper bringing up of his children. So familiar and so sacred is this notion to Europeans that any assault upon it, even now, is thought by most to betoken a godless and profligate disposition, hating the divinely appointed order of the world and in love with anarchy. But while it would be straying far from the fact to accuse American institutions of fostering religious unbelief, and evident as it is that the masses of the Great Republic are as law-abiding as the inhabitants of Lancashire or the Lothians, we shall find that the view upon which Europe has constructed its monarchies, oligarchies, and commonwealths, not only does not prevail, but would not be understood, at Washington. And thus, the functions of a Church, or a University, or an Academy of Science and Art, all of which have been exercised directly by European Governments, or under their influence and supervision, in America belong to private and voluntary associations, which last only so long as the individuals

composing them think fit, and not a moment longer.

The 'omnipotence of Parliament' has, therefore, no meaning in America. And the sphere of State interference is jealously circumscribed. The people are taught, by tradition as much as by experience, to cherish a rooted distrust in their own agents; and the Constitution, abounding in 'checks and balances,' seems to be less apprehensive of the evils which might follow upon a deadlock between the various members of the Legislature, or between that and the Executive, than of the tyranny which has again and again resulted from a strong power at the centre. By a complicated system of voting, and lately by putting the absolute veto, for use and not for show, into the hands of State Governors and City Mayors, the American people have thought to defend themselves from injustice and malversation, well pleased when the public authorities were as fast bound as legal ingenuity could contrive to bind them. What could be less in accordance with the reforming temper and tactics which during the last sixty years have employed the House of Commons to new-model the State, and which are now bent on using it to regulate industry? 'Analyze the programme of the Communalists,' remarks Mr. Herbert Spencer as he looks out on European politics, 'observe what is hoped for by the adherents of the Social and Democratic Republic, or study the ideas of legislative action which our own Trades-Unionists entertain, and you find the implied belief to be that a Government, organized after an approved pattern, will be able to remedy all the evils complained of, and to secure each proposed benefit.' Now this, we may say, is a good description of what the American idea of government is not. Their Federal Executive, in the striking words of Jefferson, does but stand for the department of Foreign Affairs in the several States. And neither the State, city, nor township, has any function beyond that of seeing to the execution of those measures which the people themselves have resolved upon. The 'wisdom of Parliament' and the 'wisdom of our ancestors' would alike fail to excite sentiments of respect in the breasts of the Americans. They are far from supposing that Congress knows more than they know themselves. It has not been created to teach them religion or civilization. It is simply the humble instrument of the national will, and this in matters which are as plain as they are practical. Popular freedom means, in short, as little government as possible, and an executive with no power of standing by itself.

Subordination, then, has become feeble because self-control

and self-reliance have gained immeasurably in strength. In like manner, men of great genius or uncommon talent are not required at the head of departments, the work of which is chiefly routine. Politicians need not represent the culture, energy, or moral dignity of the nation, for the god-like functions assigned to them in a Platonic State are exercised in America, not by them at all, but by such individuals as can influence their fellows by private and combined effort. Mediocrities are chosen to public place on the system of 'rotation,' or of giving every man a chance. Neither merit nor past services can, or indeed upon the American system ought to prevail, against the principle of letting each have his turn when the party with which he has voted comes into office. And Europeans who express their astonishment at the rule which gives the spoils to the victor-implying that one hundred and twenty thousand Federal offices change hands every four years-should bear in mind its true significance. upon which a light is thrown by the famous Greek method of 'sortition,' or casting of lots, with the avowed intention of preventing officials from becoming a caste or a hierarchy. The Presidential storm, which, like some gigantic quartan ague, periodically wraps the country in a whirlwind of emotion, has, from this point of view, its advantages. It pulls down and lays level the high places, and those who sit in them, that Republican equality may be maintained. The President of yesterday subsides into the College professor of to-day. And the White House is open to all the world; but not even General Grant shall be allowed a third term in office, for it would be setting a dangerous example, and any man taken at random is good enough for the duties which the President is called on to perform.

The American, we perceive, does not worship State authority, or those in whom it is for the time embodied, neither does he regard it as the one great instrument and the abiding channel of civilization. To him it is but the means of accomplishing certain definite ends, which may perhaps be summed up in the defence of the nation against its enemies, and the enforcing of contracts made by private agreement. Secure as he is in 'wealthy rest,' threatened by no hostile fleets or armies, and free from diplomatic complications, he presents the fairest type of the 'industrial,' as contrasted with the 'military' system which has so extensively prevailed in less fortunate Europe. He may boast, with Pericles in the famous funeral-speech, that his people, though not trained to war and fintent upon their own business or pleasure, as freemen should be, have

proved

proved themselves, when war burst upon them, greater than expectation. They have maintained their Union, by force of arms, yet absorbed their army, so soon as its task was over, into the rank of citizens. It is in the highest degree improbable that they should again for a long while be required to beat their ploughshares into swords, or their pruninghooks into spears; for a problem so hard to unravel as that of Slavery does not seem to be among the troubles of the future. Hence we may suppose that the end of government in America will be more and more the upholding of just contracts, seeing that internal security does, on the whole, take care of itself, and will increase in proportion as the South and West grow populous. No politicians in the United States would dream of restoring the institutions which in Europe have accompanied or survived monarchy. The Churches do not ask to be endowed and would resent being established. Hereditary rank is a flower which will not bear transplanting in American soil. Even precedence in society flourishes only where diplomatists and their wives from the Old World cast upon it a ray of passing sunshine. Ecclesiastical dignities find it most natural and convenient to lay aside the pomp and circumstance which, during an earlier age and in countries where the altar and the throne reflected a lustre upon one another, seemed to their predecessors not incompatible with apostolic simplicity. But, in every case, the 'powers that be' live and move in an atmosphere of freedom, and are the first to acknowledge that they exist for the good of the people.

The consequences which follow upon this bold and simple view of the duties of government, are no less important than interesting. If, to borrow an apt phrase of Mr. Spencer's, 'society is not something manufactured by statesmen,' and if, given a certain type of character, 'the vital processes of spontaneous association' go forward with sufficient energy, it is manifest that politics will not count for much with a busy and enterprising people, and that, instead of making the State an idol, they will rather laugh at those who cry to it upon every possible emergency, 'O Baal, hear us.' They will be patient, as well as contemptuous, when its shortcomings are dwelt upon, paying its various departments as little reverence as Englishmen think of paying to the Post Office or the Inland Revenue. Except when they have been roused by much canvassing, they will either not vote at all, or will vote as the party leader tells them. They will leave politics to the politicians as they leave justice to the judges, not from carelessness or lack of patriotism, but with a good-humoured expectation expectation that if anything goes wrong it will right itself in time, and with the toleration of wise men for imperfect machinery. The Constitution requires every citizen to have a mind of his own; but it may be questioned how far the average democrat has fulfilled so severe a duty. It is much simpler to take your stand in the ranks of a well-organized party, obeying the word of command when given, than to decide one by one the points in a vast programme, where much is debateable, and where a right decision would mean insight and inquiry exceeding in most cases the stock of information conveyed by the public-school training, and little enlightened by the principles laid down in newspapers which enjoy the widest

circulation.

Political parties, and the machine which they control, have thus usurped in America the influence attaching in other lands, not in the first place to party, but to ancient lineage, public rank, and eminent services rendered to the State. In England, the historic parties, although divided to some extent by principles, have never wholly absorbed into themselves the great personages who gave them splendour and dignity. Quite the reverse, in fact; for it was the men of name or of estate who upheld the parties, and without such until of late years no political association could make itself felt in the House of Commons. But in America the party, whether Republican or Democrat, overshadows its members, and gives them an importance which it can as easily take away. Not eloquence but management is the desirable gift in those who would lead their party while seeming to follow it. An individual, such as the late Mr. Blaine, may exercise large power within the camp, but he must not put on the semblance of a dictator; he is not permitted to be a demagogue, like Cleon or Hyperbolus, for he remains the servant of the people and their mouthpiece. The principle which the Athenians expressed in their word 'ostracism,'-we may translate it 'distrust of the individual,'-recurs at every turn in the American system. When, as in the great railroad companies, one man is king, with no constitution to check or thwart him, and the economic fortune of a network of cities in his pocket, the outward form of the association does not change; it remains a society of shareholders, all free and all independent, nor does the law know anything of Mr. Vanderbilt or Mr. Villiers, who are but shareholders like the rest. But the party, unlike the railroad, insists on its dividends; and in gaining these, or in assigning them, a great and wide stain of corruption has infected the politics of the country, and is the despair of its most loyal and devoted sons.

This

This spreading plague, which scars the forehead of Democracy in America, will be deemed by some the token of a declining moral standard, and a Nemesis to be looked for when the ancient safeguards of honour-a throne and a class of hereditary nobles-have been taken away. But corruption, and the waste of public funds, are characteristic of no special polity. They have abounded, under slightly varying forms, in monarchies and republics alike. And if they are symptoms of a disease, which is but too certain, the cure must be sought deeper than in a mere change of machinery, although by certain judicious changes it may be hastened. Mr. Bryce, a friendly yet candid critic, believes that while the State legislatures are often incompetent and corrupt, the Administration or Executive, outside the great capitals, such as New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, San Francisco, and Chicagoa sad catalogue - will bear comparison with the ordinary governments in Western Europe. On the other hand, Mr. Spencer, judging by written evidence, for he has not travelled in the United States, does not shrink from expressing his opinion, that in the land of liberty 'representative government, rightly so called, has become a sham, under the disguise of which there exists an oligarchy of office-holders, officeseekers, and men who exercise irresponsible power.' From these strong words, we might be tempted to conclude that life, liberty, and property among the Americans are by no means secure; and that some form of tyrannical usurpation holds the citizens of the Republic at its mercy. But however great may be the evils of corruption, it has never suspended the Habeas Corpus or taken a single life; and its dealings with public and private property, though from every point of view indefensible, stop short, as might be expected, of the confiscations by due course of law and the high-handed plundering, from which no European government has refrained in the past.

Corruption is a deadly thing, but it works within a circle of its own. The plébiscite, which must decide on changes in the constitution of States, which elects not only town councillors but judges, and which is the great act of the people in their corporate capacity, will, from its very nature, be applicable rather to broad and simple issues than to the details on which effective administration depends. Moreover, its due effect is weakened by the liberality in receiving new citizens which, on the whole, has met with abundant reward, yet is to a large extent responsible for the worst features in the maladministration of the cities. European immigrants from countries like Poland, Italy, or Bohemia, to whom self-government is a foreign idea.

idea, could not be supposed to vote intelligently in a Republic of which not alone the history and the character, but the very language, has yet to be learned by them. New York, with so large a foreign-born population, has been well named the 'doormat of the Continent.' It is the dust heap of Europe indeed, and its solid miles of misery, crowded into unwholesome and degraded lodging-houses, offer a problem to the statesman which it would be exceedingly unfair to term American. Perhaps the blindness of party has never issued in a less patriotic act than in manufacturing voters out of this incoherent and debased mixture, without giving its dregs time to settle. The native American, whether from New England, Pennsylvania, or Ohio, seems to have inherited that genius for selfgovernment which relies upon its own energy rather than waits for laws or leaders to tell it what it shall do. And, happily, it is the farmers of 'Keystone,' or their kindred in the rapidlygrowing West, that decide the policy of the States on momentous occasions. In the workaday world, however, which politicians inhabit, where to distribute salaries among friends and dependents is the height of wisdom, and office means opportunities of corruption, party managers have triumphed over the busy silent millions; and the plébiscite is too great and ponderous a weapon to bring down upon these knaves. That 'eternal vigilance which is the price of freedom' implies not only a sound mind in the nation at large, but knowledge, leisure, and constant self-sacrifice. It would make of politics (using the term in a wide sense) not so much a profession as a religion. 'Democracy,' it has been remarked in a famous novel, 'asserts the fact that our masses are now raised to a higher intelligence than formerly'; it means ' faith in human nature, faith in science, faith in the survival of the fittest.' And though an experiment, it moves in the only direction which society can take. Americans are not dismayed when they view its deficiencies; for they argue that the mind which marks them for condemnation, will one day make an end of them. The cure for political corruption is not less democracy but more democracy, spreading the light and inoculating these imported masses with the American spirit which, if it tolerates the greed and dishonesty of some of the public servants, is not hoodwinked, but only too busy at present to take this matter in hand. The Demos of Aristophanes was an imbecile: the American people are patient because they know their strength.

Meanwhile, the harm done is visible enough in many directions. Divided power being irresponsible, discussion secret or confidential, party supreme, ministers not obliged to render an account to the House, members chosen by the district

in which they live and often not known outside it, finance so handled that one department takes the revenue and another has the spending of it, there ensues such a waste of public money as none but a rich young millionaire among the nations could afford. The amazing system of war pensions, and the problem yearly put forward with grave looks of 'how to spend the surplus,' which should never have been collected, tell a tale not unlike that of the desolate tracts where forests, destined by nature to last during centuries, have in a few short years been laid waste. A national surplus of millions on the one hand, balanced by a growing army of vagrants and proletarians on the other, points to problems which clamour for solution, although in candour we must own that Europe, with its 'submerged tenths' and its socialist propaganda, needs to lighten its peculiar darkness before proceeding to criticize American institutions, as if they had created the poverty they have merely not abolished. Mr. Bryce holds that while no form of government needs capable leaders so much as Democracy (which is perhaps a harder saying than he imagines), the people of the United States are neither well led nor well served. He might have added that they are most certainly well exploited, though not as individuals so much as in their national possessions and future prospects. For party government, instead of being an appliance to carry out the popular will, is apt to confuse the popular intelligence. And the legislatures, which are the trustees of the State or the Nation, have in too many instances first levied a tax on public companies, and then assigned to them for this scandalous consideration, privileges, grants, and monopolies, that violate the most elementary principles of justice and enable some few daring villains to set the public at defiance. The authorities which should enforce just contracts have themselves, over and over again, become parties to contracts which are essentially unjust. They have bartered public rights for private and personal advantages, using the place of trust to which they have been voted simply as an office where they might sell over the counter great tracts of land, the highways of the cities, the common rights of the market, and the control of natural resources, and leasing out the continent of which they should have been so proud, 'like to a tenement or pelting farm,' to speculators, stockjobbers, and company-promoters.

This magnificent estate, which should have been held in trust for mankind, they have, so far as in them lies, squandered and mortgaged, until it seems the merest truism to declare that, in American cities, the 'saloon-interest' governs, and, in the Vel. 177.—No. 354.

country at large, the 'railroad-interest.' Monarchy, as Mr. Bryce would say, has come in by the window after being thrust out at the door; but it resembles rather a Heptarchy in which rival kings contend for the dominion, economic if not political, of the labouring multitude. The 'industrial type' of society, which has supplanted the older ones in America, is not yet peaceful, or co-operative, but militant; and the great army of officials, unable to beat down the railway kings, or with no mandate from the people to undertake so formidable a task, serves those whom it cannot rule. There is often a confederacy between the department of the day and the monopolists, founded on the perfectly intelligible axiom, 'Do ut des.' Individual Presidents, governors, and holders of place may be, as they often are, quite above suspicion; but they cannot grapple with the system except where the law has provided them with the power of veto. And that this should be the weapon of public defence is surely a matter for reflection. It implies that, so long as the average of intelligence does not rise, there must be in a well-ordered union of States, not one dictator but many, appointed by law and not by intrigue, to face and overcome the boss,' as he is vulgarly styled in a language worthy of him, who with his 'heelers and workers,' his packed 'primaries,' and his saloon 'caucus,' represents, under curiously varied circumstances, the old Greek tyrant of Syracuse or Agrigentum. In the last quarter of a century New York has, with mingled shame and amusement, seen itself under the government of Tweed and 'Tammany,' as though half-a-dozen corsairs, with their cut-throat crew following them, had landed at Castle Garden and taken the city by storm. Philadelphia has had its 'Gas Ring,' and San Francisco its 'Sand lot party.' And the domestic records of Chicago, were they printed, would tell how impossible it is for honest officials to keep their places, against the will of those who do not scruple to call themselves masters of its streets, and who care not a jot for the Constitution provided they can make a topping fortune. The iniquitous sale of public property, by which individuals grow wealthy while the nation is bleeding with open wounds, may be reckoned the sure proof that a Democracy, unless it would sink into serfdom more or less disguised, must look about for means of protecting its rights, and not allow the suzerainty which belongs to it to slip through its hands into those of huge and rapidly growing combinations, themselves under the sway of a 'one man power.'

This, in a blind half-instinctive way, the newer States out West are feeling; and they would eagerly welcome Mr. Spencer's

argument

argument that, since the people have now taken the place of the king, whatever control over property was vested in him of old time, must now by parity of reasoning be vested in them. States like Kansas and Iowa have claimed as taxes a third of the citizen's income. Provisions are made, in the nature of factory laws, cheap trains, homestead security, and the inspection of private industrial enterprises, which adherents of the orthodox economic system would have thought inconsistent with the true nature of business and of government. 'Labour Party' does not, as in England, represent so much a class interest, as deep dissatisfaction with monopolies and their autocratic control. But in no country is private ownership more respected, though it has ceased to fence itself in behind walled gardens, or in baronial keeps. The ideals of Communism, despite Mr. Bellamy's Utopia, have little attraction for the born citizen of the States. He believes that every man, in that free and undeveloped country, may win by the labour of head and hands abundant recompense; and, generous to a fault, he is yet disposed to think that any one who has not risen in the world must be wanting in sense or sobriety. He is optimist and Epicurean, untroubled by the religious doubts concerning the lawfulness of great wealth, and still more of money-making, which have passed into Europe from Oriental mystics, and have given rise not only to monastic orders with their vows of poverty and self-denial, but to the individual asceticism, and the language corresponding with it, which are still to be found even in England.

To say, however, that men who drive the political machine shall not be permitted to 'offer the dreams of their fancy for a model of the world,' is a very different thing from despising ideals or not aiming at progress. The question concerns means, not ends; appliances and methods, not the desirability of making a commonwealth as perfect as human genius and Christian aspirations can make it. Freedom comes first, by right of reason, for men who have been drilled and batoned into order, though it were beautiful as the design of the Parthenon, remain as dead stones, which will never grow into the living temple that true political philosophy has in view. Artificial moulding can produce a smooth surface at the expense of God-given variety; but a State should not be a regiment, and the only lasting moral order must, like the kingdom of God, be within us, and make citizens by spontaneous development. Doubtless, this is not the speediest method of securing results on paper and for show, but it is the method which Nature pursues when she would grow her oaks and her cedars, lift up the species of plant

y 2

and animal to their topmost heights, and unfold the universe of life and mind. From the Slave States which adored their Heaven-descended Pharaohs and built pyramids and palaces by the labour of millions of captives taken in battle, to this selfconscious, self-determining Society, in which every man owns his life, his intellect, his hands, and whatever they can lawfully produce without hurting his neighbour, the advance seems incontestable. And the very mistakes of democratic legislatures. bringing with them their own punishment, are a lesson in spontaneity as well as in wisdom. The child learns to walk by a series of falls, some of which may hurt him not a little; but, unless he risks tumbling, he will never walk. When California sets up a Constitution which excludes the Chinese, or takes no proper account of the social forces regulating labour and capital, the American public watches the experiment with interest but without misgiving. For it has not learnt to stereotype these laws under a general plea of sacredness. They are subject to the incessant criticism of individuals who recognize no superior, and who have been taught from their tenderest years that they must govern themselves, and not merely let themselves be governed. Society in its corporate capacity has rights and duties; but these not being all assigned to constituted authorities, such as a National Church or an hereditary government, the way to maintain and fulfil them is a matter of discussion and voluntary effort. 'Private enterprise,' once more observes Mr. Spencer, who would seem to have caught the very spirit of American institutions, 'is ubiquitous and infinitely varied in form.' It has built a hundred and fifty thousand miles of railway in the States, transplanted New England to the Centre and West, colonized from the Great Lakes to the Pacific Slope, created a national temper among the sixty-six millions of this incredibly mixed population, adapted better and better machinery to the raising of the immense harvests of Indiana, Minnesota, and the inexhaustible North-West, and, with one great and instructive exception, has kept the peace all over the Republic during the hundred and seventeen years of its existence. We ought not to be surprised if Americans repeat the proud saying of Pericles to his fellow-citizens, 'We live under a Constitution such as in nowise to envy the laws of other peoples, but ourselves rather set an example than think of imitating them.' The Republic, they would affirm, has been the schoolmistress of Europe, showing by a series of object lessons the true scope and significance of those Democratic watchwords which, since the French Revolution, have been taken up by the multitude everywhere, but mostly as in a dream to

which the realities did not correspond. What elsewhere is but a Utopia, in the States of the Union has become, in essential

lineaments, a fact.

Of course, it may be asked whether Americans have fulfilled the second part of that sentence in the speech of Pericles from which we have been quoting. Do they, 'viewed individually, enable the same man,' who as a political unit is so unfettered, 'to furnish himself out and suffice to himself in the greatest variety of ways, and with the most complete grace and refinement?' The freedom of their social conduct is granted, but how much does it actually realize of the things which make up a beautiful, harmonious, and exquisite human life? Or is freedom across the Atlantic an excuse for ugliness, vulgarity, licence, selfishness, and the commonplace? And whence are to spring their ideals, when no class of society is charged either to seek or to guard them? In Europe, we enjoy a tradition of art, literature, conduct, and religious beliefs, which is embodied in public institutions and furnishes the standard upon which individuals have been moulded during ages. And we do not easily comprehend how a nation which has dispensed with that cathedra of social doctrine,—to speak in the language of Comte, -can acquire a fresh one. Emerson may ask for an American philosophy, and platform orators, both men and women, declare that they want a religion purified from its old-world elements. Be it so, if the thing is possible. Only some would inquire, where are the sources of this Instauratio Magna of learning and revelation to be sought for?

Well, it is answered, whatever they may be, the law of equal freedom must remain intact. Neither Church nor State shall, by absolute decree, impose its conception of the desirable life upon citizens. There ought to be, indeed, a public-school training, since most are in favour of it, and it is the simplest way of carrying out the wish of parents, who do not surrender their freedom but entrust the teachers with some portion of it under conditions. No children are compelled to attend school, and private establishments may be set up everywhere. Beyond this elementary stage, moreover, the authorities do not wish to go. Universities abound in America of varying excellence from Harvard in New England and Johns Hopkins at Baltimore downwards; but their quaint personal names would be proof enough, were any needed, that to private individuals their foundation has been due, as by private boards of management they are carried on. The State gives them no charter; their standing with the public depends wholly on the success they happen to achieve; and their discipline, like that of the smallest of private academies, remains subject to the ordinary law and its officials. Science, research, and intellectual training, when it passes the standard of the common schools, are no more established than is religion. Yet, on this account as Americans believe and Mr. Bryce repeats, the principle of individual benevolence has grown mighty. Wealth in the hands of no small number is looked upon as a trust; and millionaires, however they came by their millions, manifest a generous rivalry in spending them on works of public and lasting benefit. New York has its Roosevelt Hospital, its Carnegie Music Hall and Library, its Art Gallery filled from private collections, its splendid Roman Catholic Cathedral built by voluntary offerings. Philadelphia has its Girard University, and Chicago will soon have as imposing an institution to bear witness to Mr. Rockefeller's enterprise and good fortune in establishing the Standard Oil Trust. At San Francisco, a colossal estate has been settled by Mr. Leland Stanford on a third University called after his name. And throughout the country, hospitals and seats of learning thus endowed, seem to affirm the law which Mr. Spencer formulates, that, with free institutions, private persons will of themselves undertake all that paternal governments have attempted for the happiness of their subjects. The advantage, it is clear, remains with the American system. Instead of submissive conformity exhibited by regiments of automata, mechanically governed and in a crisis lacking initiative and good sense, there will be the creative spirit which, knowing its own aims and sympathizing with every kind of beneficent energy, takes delight in doing good and in making it possible for others to do good likewise. In such a way were the famous medieval universities founded. Nor has commerce owed its extension to the governments which hampered it with absurd laws, nor science (the eye of commerce in our time) to boards of Stateprofessors and grants from the revenue; while art and literature, which, being confessedly the domain of individual genius, may be encouraged but cannot be created by kings or ministers, have followed a course of their own, the determining causes of which remain to this day a secret.

Freedom, then, is a negative condition, which, leaving individuals to themselves, does not guarantee positive results; for it holds within it no pattern of the desirable life, nor does it hinder a man from making an ill use of the noblest things. He is free to rise towards the light precisely because he is free to go down into darkness. But though freedom, like free will, implies these alternatives, yet when it is taken away, the civilization

civilization which an absolute ruler imposes can never satisfy human or divine requirements, any more than the finest-seeming actions will be meritorious where free will is wanting. Let us turn, therefore, to the national character of the Americans, if we would prophesy of their future. Perhaps, in extolling freedom, there is some temptation to overlook this second and equally momentous factor in the growth of a nation. What are the things which they love or hate? Who are their heroes? What is the kind of life they would fain live, which they admire and seek after, and count those happy who are in the enjoyment of it? And do we observe any signs of an upward

march in their thoughts and aspirations?

This last is, in truth, the important question. If America had remained stationary, exhibiting the same character on the whole as De Tocqueville noted sixty years ago, and Charles Dickens travestied in his letters and sketches ten years afterwards, we might feel that Democracy, not indeed as a political appliance, but as a form of civilization, had proved a failure. The freedom which means buying and selling human creatures, and which is compatible with a tyrannical public opinion, rude boasting, rough manners, undisguised worship of money, and the absence of dignity within and without its monotonous households, would have in nowise answered our expectations. So severe a judgment, if it was ever merited, cannot be passed on the America which has invited us to its World's Fair. Its advance during this energetic half-century has been conspicuous, not only in wealth, but in the higher things, in demeanour, in liberty of speech, and in the feeling for art and civilization. But, to take the most memorable instance, Slavery, which might have been extended across the continent and become as sacred a thing as the Capitol, is now no more. The principle of freedom has, by those historic amendments of the Constitution and at the expense of a million lives, been made the corner-stone, which it was always intended to be, of the Republic; and race and colour shall henceforth be no warrant for taking from the meanest his liberty. When all deductions are made, and the whole story is told, sparing neither North nor South, it does not seem too much to say, that the emancipation of the negroes will remain the most striking moral event of our century. It has given pathos to the record of material expansion, and to American principles a firmness and grandeur which are worthy of so great a people. And, in the strength of them, we may well suppose, they will go on to deal with the problems thence arising, even when the dark races have doubled their numbers and by training and resolve are beginning to compete with their white brethren. But much more will they ascend to the place marked out for those 'who speak the tongue that Shakspere spake,' and nourish a reverence for the sobriety and strength of Milton and his compeers.

The struggle for ideals must, we grant, replace the old protective system, by which one race or colour was given supreme command over the resources, whether drawn from the heavens above or the earth beneath, which the nation held. But the charm is more potent than ever, of 'superior intellect, imagination, and polity,' to which Grote ascribes the success of the Hellenes in Magna Græcia. Now such a polity, founded on English and even Teutonic precedents going back to the earliest Arvan times, the Americans have established. 'Their elective magistrates chosen for a term, their jealous watch over the chief of the State, their liking for federal partition,' says M. de Gobineau, 'recall the vicampatis of the primitive Hindus, the separation into tribes, and the leagues of kindred peoples that formerly overran Northern Persia, Germany, and Britain.' In other words, the dominant English have never liked and will not endure a centralized Empire. And this deep-rooted sentiment of the adventurous, sea-roving Norseman has made the round of the world. It clings to federation, but abjures the Roman or the French bureaucracy. But for the very reason that it is self-respecting, it is no lover of chaos, and the anarchist who fails to grasp its method of give and take, live and let live, seems to all who share in it a madman or a dreamer. On these principles, the Government not only of the United States, but of Canada, New Zealand, Australia, and South Africa, is now permanently established; and it follows that morals, culture, and religion will be dealt with in a like spirit. But as self-government does not lapse into anarchy among people of so steady and judicious a temper, why should we fear lest these higher goods may share that fate? If they could only be defended by absolute power and the infallibility of departments, we might indeed be apprehensive for them; but the long history of the race tells another and a less mournful tale.

For these Northern tribes have always shown a profound sense of religion, 'constantly discussing, but never denying it,' as M. de Gobineau again remarks; and their superiority in morals to the South European nations has been noted from the days of Tacitus. Puritanism carried that stern discipline to excess, and a reaction may have set in among its descendants. But Puritanism has too long furnished an 'indigenous altar' to New England, that it should suffer the frivolity of Paris or

the anarchical rage of the Italian or German revolutionary now to get the upper hand of it. The American farmer, take him all in all, is even yet old-Hebrew, believing in his Bible, unacquainted with any criticism which would endanger his creed or his morals, cautious, hard, and practical, by no means inclined to surrender the views in which he was brought up, and carefully to be distinguished from the 'heathens of the great cities,' who are mostly immigrants or their children. These, while they continue in their heathen state, may furnish a problem to the ministers of religion and the philanthropic; they may record many an unrighteous vote, swell the numbers of the discontented at tumultuous meetings, riot occasionally in Chicago, and ruffle the surface of that abiding peace which is the true characteristic of the Republic. But, politically, they do not govern, and never will. The American spirit is fast subduing them. If their children are still heathen, the blame must not be laid at the door of the Government, whose duty is as circumscribed as it is plain, but will rest with those agencies which, being appointed to hasten the kingdom of God, took too narrow a view of their own Church or Bible, and would not carry their principles into the market-place, the exchange, and the journalist's office. For though religion, among the Americans, does not 'exalt her mitred front in Parliament, the Churches exercise a power against which no active propaganda of unbelief has yet made itself felt, nor seems likely to arise.

The Federal Constitution, which in this respect all the States follow, while quite unsectarian, is reverential towards God and His Providence, and a true expression, so far as it goes, of the principles of Christianity. Great is the difference between its pious manly tone and that of the French Republicans, who will not endure that so much as the name of God should be found in children's schoolbooks. The American President, Congress, and State legislatures profess, happily for themselves, to be, as a late writer has well said, 'incompetent in spirituals'; but they are not indifferent, much less hostile, to those influences of natural and Christian truth which are uniform and definite in their action upon American life. Infidelity, scepticism, materialism, atheism, are none of them congenial to a mind so quick, sensitive, and hopeful, so aspiring and energetic, as that which in the United States builds for to-morrow and feels boundless confidence in the progress of mankind. It has a strain of Homeric simplicity, and a freedom from lassitude, which are in marked contrast to the weariness and Weltschmerz prevailing among idle or over-refined Europeans. The literature which spreads in America, humorous, direct, and sentimental, is not indeed classic; nor does it strike its roots deep in the great past of English or Greek poetry; but nothing can be less like the corrupt Realism of the French. Much of it is borrowed and imitative, and still more is commonplace; the spark of heavenly fire has fallen as yet on few of its singers and story-tellers; and originality shows itself in the shape of grotesque fancy rather than high creative thinking. The genius which may one day write immortal volumes, is absorbed in planning fresh railroads, devising more perfect machinery, governing the distribution of products, and establishing or overthrowing monopolies. But if Christian teachers desired to set up their ideals in this lower region, there is no government to hinder them, And the universities possess, among their thousands of scholars. a class adapted, by choice and temperament, to win from ancient as well as modern literatures, the light of those 'fair humanities,' which, if they be unknown and unstudied, society must needs be lacking in refinement, beauty, and attractiveness. In the best circles of America, there is even a touch of the brightness which distinguished the old French salon; but perhaps the divorce of politics from social intercourse, and the disdain felt for public life as it goes on within the lobbies and speaking-rooms of so many legislatures, have tended to give that intercourse a frivolous, self-indulgent air. The rich, certainly, have less culture than their grandsons will be invited to possess; and the cultivated few lead an exquisite but a secluded life, and make up coteries rather than set a tone to the multitude. But society, which in the exclusive sense of the word seems to be melting away in European capitals, will find much difficulty in resisting the invasion of numbers in America. Its task, indeed, rightly apprehended, is not so much to resist as to convert the invaders. And here, the whole problem of which cities like Chicago are the head and front, seems to open before us. Let us take a central point from which to survey it.

Perhaps there is no spot on the American Continent so favourable to thoughts which look before and after as the old home of the Lees at Arlington, now a deserted house on the Potomac River, with lawns spreading round about and tall oaks waving their branches in the sunlight, beneath which sixteen thousand of the Federal Army are sleeping their last sleep. A few miles down stands Mount Vernon, with Washington's tomb, and vivid memories of the Declaration of Independence which every boy in the United States has learnt by heart. Not at Mount Vernon, however, but amid the graves of the great Civil War, must we look for the scope of that Declaration. On

Confederate soil was fought the battle of Armageddon between those contrasted types of government, one of which, though the more ancient, will surely decrease while the other will increase, as the world moves forward. The militant system was not unworthily represented by these squires of the Old Dominion, with their large estates, their bondsmen and bondswomen, their exclusive manners, and their haughty self-esteem. In defence of slavery they quoted the letter of the Old Testament against the spirit of the New. They were lovers of freedom, provided always it did not spread beyond their own class. They looked down on the Yankee traders who could handle neither a horse nor a gun; and among the feudal aristocracies of Hungary or Poland they would certainly have found their likeness and been received upon an equal footing. It is not our purpose to apologize for them any more than to declaim against them. At Arlington the feeling of personal sympathy which the place evokes, is strangely divided between that heroic single figure of Lee the Virginian, putting his stainless sword into the grasp of the mother-State which had reared him so nobly, and the Federal soldiers, two thousand of whom are crowded into a nameless monument—heroes in a cause that could not even tell who they were. But the historian, bent upon viewing the march of things and the event of the battle, perceives, when he has studied the fields of death whose harvest is garnered here, that the old order, with its personal subordination, and its denial of the most sacred human rights to millions upon millions of human beings, was doomed to pass away when the Declaration of Independence had gone home to American bosoms. It passed in flame and thunder, amid the ruins of a country-side which was already fast decaying, thanks to the peculiar institution now at length beaten down. Once again, the foot-soldier had vanquished the cavalier; the man of trade had proved more than a match for the gentleman; and the resources of industry had furnished their own defence. The South itself,-witness Alabama, Georgia, and Tennessee,-is becoming, like the North, a region of mining and manufactures; the free negro competes with the white on his own ground; and the 'first families' of Virginia have but their traditions to live upon, or must forget their old dignity and work on the same terms as the rest of the world. Freedom respects them and lets them alone.

But, looking across to the Capitol shining white upon us, and away over the thousand miles to Chicago, and thence to the Pacific, we cannot but perceive that freedom has suffered portentous evils to spring up, the remedy of which can never be sought by turning back to an outworn system, but rather by studying the ends which that freedom should subserve. In the noble words of Edmund Burke, 'The only liberty is a liberty connected with order, that not only exists along with order and virtue, but cannot exist at all without them.' Politics were not made for politicians; nor the land and its resources for mere monopolists; nor wealth for idle luxury; nor men and women for vulgar self-indulgence. Where law has ceased to interfere, the public conscience must rule; if democracy implies a higher level of intelligence, it calls loudly for the establishment of ideals which may guide and enlighten it. The native American is aware of such in his Old Testament, if nowhere else. But the 'heathens of the great cities' have left their household gods across the sea; and it is only when, for example, the Russian persecution of the Jews drives a multitude of the orthodox out of Europe, that the fading forms of inherited religion take on them a little fresh colour and for a time revive. The degraded mixture of the immigrants keeps down the general average of morality and decent living; while in the second or third generation it tends to lose on one side what it gains on the other, becoming amenable to the police and more orderly, but without God in the world. Those who hold that nothing but established authority can overcome these evils, may be tempted to despair, not of the political, but of the moral outlook in America, They will be apt to reckon the number of divorces, especially among the working class, and to dwell on the scandalous laxity of the marriage-laws, in States as widely separated as Massachusetts and Iowa. They will remark how the spirit of independence is breaking up families, spoiling the education of children, substituting for the old reverence and affection a bad equality between parents and their offspring, releasing mothers from obligations once held sacred, and crowding into luxurious hotels a throng of idlers for whom the 'kindred points of Heaven and home' no longer have a meaning. And a picture as forbidding might be sketched from novels and newspapers, of the self-indulgence mixed with passion and cruelty, which is invading the urban populations. But why charge these evils, supposing them to exist in the degree alleged, upon Democracy? Have not they or their like flourished under the sway of Imperial Rome, or in the France of Louis XV.? Is political freedom the account of them, and not rather that want of the Christian temper which the machinery of law-making can certainly not create of itself, however perfect it may be? The Stoic or Puritan has been very commonly democratic in his ideas of government; but a strong custom or

an overmastering ideal sufficed to keep his lower nature in check; and it would be a ludicrous perversion of history to defend monarchical institutions on the ground of their having largely promoted virtue and established the moral law. Perhaps it is one chief merit of the Americans to have perceived with Johnson how small a part of human happiness any government can directly secure. Behind all such institutions, it is now admitted, stands the national character, which changes very slowly, yet is not, as too abstract thinkers were wont to imagine, unchangeable. And since it can be altered for the better, and there is no machinery apart from the Divine inspiration by which to alter it, the conclusion seems to be that the individuals who make up the nation are bound, in the measure of their talents, to do this great work themselves, without waiting for a signal from rulers no more enlightened, and by the nature of the case far less energetic, than enthusiastic, disinterested, and

capable reformers.

In such wise did Christianity win its lasting triumphs, not by the edicts of Constantine or Theodosius, and still less by the sword of Charlemagne, but when it was preached in meekness and spiritual power, when Apostles and missionaries carried it abroad, and the charm of its civilizing spirit drew barbarians to learn from its teachers and then to worship in the sanctuaries which they set up. This parallel between the methods of democratic freedom and Christian principles, if it has any warrant, is surely most striking. It implies building up from within rather than coercing from without,-a slow process, but effectual and in its nature enduring. We may compare it, indeed, with our English way of unravelling the Gordian knot by dint of patience, instead of taking the sword to it. And remarkable it is, likewise, that this large development of moral suasion, where the voice and the pen count for so much, and the cannon rusts disused in the armoury, was not attempted in a moment of caprice by the founders of the Constitution, but grew out of their circumstances, and, like the stages of organic life which it resembles, was inevitable when it came. Not even the bitterest enemy of popular government would now suggest a backward step; it is universally felt that the bounds of interference from authority have been fixed and cannot be enlarged. The principle is beyond discussion, however difficult it may be to decide whether certain instances fall under it. So that if the nation cannot rise to such a height of nobleness as their free government demands, the multitude will suffer and be uneasy, but none will venture to suggest as a way of escape that one class should rule the rest, or any persons whatever be perpetually entrusted with

with absolute power. The State is, indeed, a guardian of those collective rights which the individuals composing it are unable to exercise or defend; and among them are such as secure an open market, free roads, and access to the primary requisites of civilization. But all these must be so defended as to leave individuals the yet more primary right to pursue happiness in their own way, and to keep a free spirit in a free body. The difficulty of adjustment may be great and even formidable, but the principles of the Constitution must remain intact. This conviction, which lies deep in American hearts, is at once the cause of their loyalty,-which surprises and charms the stranger,—and of the conservative spirit in which all, save young Western States, have approached the great social and labour problems. The people may smart under injustice, and detest monopolies; but they will not hazard their freedom in the hope of procuring speedy redress. They have hitherto believed that private property, ascending up even to the millions of Mr. Jay Gould, is a legitimate deduction from the principles of freedom. And until they have been convinced that it is not so, State Socialism will find fewer adherents among native Americans than it has made in England,-to say nothing of bureaucratic Germany, where it seems but a natural advance upon conscription for military purposes, to regulate industry and divide its products by law.

But, unless the Anglo-Saxon elements are lost in that 'horrible confusion,' and 'multiplication of half-castes,' which excited M. de Gobineau's loathing, we may confidently assert that the United States have entered on the path of social progress, as well as independence, and that each will contribute to establish the other, freedom leading on to perfection, though by slow circuitous steps, and progress making men less patient of a control which they no longer require. Commerce, guided by science and accessible to the influences of art and culture, will not be content with the colossal and too uniform Chicago of the present. It will never rest until it has stored in white palaces, as permanent as they are beautiful, its countless products, the exchanges of every land. It will perceive that labour which is fostered by due rewards and has leisure to cultivate its intelligence and its moral qualities, tasting the joy of those things its hands have made, is beyond calculation superior to that which is underfed, ill-paid, harassed with overtime, and condemned to the leavings of civilization. The story of American industry, with its tens of thousands of happy and well-educated artisans, preaches this great economic truth trumpet-tongued. And a government of free citizens will

know

know how to deal wisely with rings, and trusts, and monopolies. The undoubted principle of the national suzerainty must be allowed time and occasion to develop on the lines of justice. Furthermore, religion becoming yet again the social force it was meant to be, will add a nobler rhythm to the lives which, at present, seem to us low-pitched and common, or dedicated in a blind way to making money without an object. And the education of the citizen in science, literature, and politics, will receive upon it a more heavenly light as Christian principles, dissevered from the bad old memories of coercion, are allowed their legiti-

mate influence and tested by their fruits.

If, as we have said, the elements of the American Constitution are freedom, equality of right, and a liberal spirit, we should hail it as a happy coincidence, or rather as a proof that men's designs are overruled by One greater than they, when we find this very description applicable, as we know it has been applied, to that Athenian culture from which we have derived our models of science, eloquence, poetry, and the human arts, but also, in a still higher region, to the New Testament, which is at length beginning to be recognized as the standard of civilization. In this triple cord, not easily broken, there seems to be a firm security against Anarchism, Communism, and all other assaults upon ordered freedom. Nor is it unphilosophical to reckon the price at which alone these heirs of English liberty will preserve their majestic inheritance. As in the body of man himself, so is it in the body politic; the higher state involves a less stable Uniformity may be purchased by the discipline of the army; but life is made larger and rises higher at the cost of continual movement, which sometimes betrays itself by tumultuous shocks and fierce dissensions. The American, devoted to precedents and as slow to be convinced as he is quick of apprehension, seems to have been provided by nature with a defence of which his freedom may yet stand in need. But even if he should be destined to take up arms again, and the question of labour, capital, wages, and property, should at length demand solution, as that of Slavery did, on a hundred battle-fields, he will not despair of the Republic. The nation will emerge from that conflict, he believes, greater than when she entered upon it. For he would say with the Greek statesman that civilized freedom, and the dauntless spirit of originality, and the conviction that every citizen belongs to the country and the country to him, are a preparation equal to any social emergency which may hereafter arise. To which he can justly add, herein more fortunate than the Athenian, that, if the English and their descendants are by nature independent, they have shown a genius a genius for organizing their own lives equal to the Roman. though most unlike it in detail. And hence he will not imagine that Russian communists, or anarchists whose hand is against every man, will scatter and destroy the Commonwealth of freedom. But he would now, perhaps, when he has gathered the world at Chicago, do wisely to pursue that original and inspiriting idea which led him to make of the Exposition, so far as might be, a Congress of thinkers no less than of mechanical and artistic products. He need not imitate Europe, yet he may learn a deal from her, for she represents to him Greek culture, Roman law, English enterprise, and Hebrew religion. These are but a portion of the great treasures of intellect and tradition which she holds in her keeping. To say that she has proved herself the wisest of guardians might perhaps be excessive. But the treasures are there, lying as it were in the arena, to be the prize of that most energetic and aspiring race which has the courage to seize upon them. Happily, too, they are of the kind which may be divided, yet without being diminished. If Europe herself is to advance, they must find new and telling uses. And America, in the secure possession of freedom, has now the task of showing to the next age a polity at once Christian, refined, and righteous, the individual being inspired by the noblest ideals, and realizing them in the ampler ether and diviner air of a liberty which has come down to him through the long English centuries, and which is consecrated by the blood of many martyrdoms.

ART. II.—1. The Times, July 11, 1893. Official Programme of the Naval Manœuvres of 1893.

 The Influence of Sea Power upon History, 1660-1783. By Captain A. T. Mahan, United States Navy. London, 1890.

 The Influence of Sea Power upon the French Revolution and Empire, 1793-1812. By Captain A. T. Mahan. London, 1892.

THE objects of the Naval Manœuvres of 1893 were defined in the Official Programme to be 'on the part of one side to obtain command of the sea between Great Britain and Ireland, and on the part of the other side to prevent this.' The two sides were, for purposes of distinction, designated the Red and the Blue respectively, and it was to the Red side that was assigned the object of obtaining the command of the sea. What was meant by obtaining the command of the sea was further defined as follows:—'If the Blue side has either been defeated or has been compelled to retire to a distance to avoid an engagement, and the Blue torpedo-boats have been destroyed or reduced to inactivity, the Admiral of the Red side is to report by telegraph if he considers that his side has gained command of the sea so that a large expedition may be sent across it.' Here we have a clear and authoritative definition of what is meant, in a strategical sense, by the command of the sea. arbitrary claim to exercise 'the dominion of the seas,' such as England often advanced in bygone times, can give any assurance of holding the command of the sea in the proper strategical sense. The ships of a foreign Power might be content, as a matter of courtesy, or even as a formal recognition of maritime supremacy, to lower their topsails in the narrow seas in the presence of a British man-of-war. But when any foreign Power felt itself strong enough at sea to dispute the maritime supremacy of Great Britain, no formal claim to the dominion or sovereignty of the seas would avail to release Great Britain from the necessity of fighting to secure the command of the sea. In truth, England claimed the sovereignty of the seas long before she was strong enough to secure the command of the sea; and now that the command of the sea in the strategical sense is necessary to her existence as an Empire, she has long ago abandoned her former claim to the sovereignty of the seas.*

^{*} In fact, she did so precisely at the moment when the battle of Trafalgar had, so far as the struggle with Napoleon was concerned, finally and decisively established her strategical command of the sea. 'The battle of Trafalgar having Vol. 177.—No. 354.

If then we desire clearly to understand what is meant by the command of the sea in a strategical sense, it is necessary first to dismiss from our minds all ideas associated with the sovereignty of the seas as formerly claimed by this country. There is very little relation between the two. Yet they have often been confounded by writers of repute. The utmost that can be said is that the one is symbolical of the other; that from the earliest times the claim of England to the sovereignty of the seas has been the formal and almost instinctive expression of the true conditions of national defence for an island situated like Great Britain. Selden, for example, in his 'Mare Clausum,' claims the dominion of the sea as an ancient and inseparable appendage to the ownership of the land of Britain; and he sets forth the limits of this dominion, of which the more important, for our purpose, are those which apply to what are called 'the narrow seas.' Over these the British dominion is, according to Selden, complete, and extends to the east and north as far as the shores of the opposite European countries.

Here we see the older and more conventional idea of the sovereignty of the sea gradually passing into the later and more scientific idea of the command of the sea. Great Britain is an island. Its foreign commerce must pass over the seas, and no enemy can reach it except by crossing the sea. There is no parallel to this in the history of the world. Great nations have risen by the power of the sea and have fallen again by the loss of it. But in all such cases sea-power was an instrument of expansion, not, as in the case of England, a condition of existence. In modern times, as regards England, it has been both. But from the days when England first became a nation, sea-power has been the indispensable condition of her existence, whereas it is only in comparatively modern times that it has become an instrument of her Imperial expansion. This indeed is the essential function discharged by sea-power in the history of civilization. It transmutes a city or a nation into an Imperial dominion. 'I cannot fiddle,' said Themistocles, 'but I can make a small town a great city.' The means thereto

so completely humbled the naval power of France and Spain, suggested to the consideration of the Board of Admiralty, with the approbation of the Government, the omission of that arbitrary and offensive article, which required naval officers to demand the striking of the flag and lowering of the topsail from every foreign ship they might fall in with. That invidious assumption of a right, though submitted to generally by foreigners for some centuries, could not probably have been maintained much longer except at the cannon's mouth; and it was considered therefore that the proper time had come when it might, both morally and politically, be spontaneously abandoned.' ('Life of Earl Howe,' by Sir John Barrow, chap, vii. p. 200.)

was sea-power. 'Consilium Pompeii,' says Cicero, 'plane Themistocleum est; putat enim qui mari potitur eum rerum potiri.' On this Bacon comments:—

"We see the great effects of battles by sea: the battle of Actium decided the empire of the world; the battle of Lepanto arrested the greatness of the Turk. . . . Thus much is certain: that he that commands the sea is at great liberty, and may take as much and as little of the war as he will; whereas those that be strongest by land are many times nevertheless in great straits. Surely at this day with us of Europe, the vantage of strength at sea (which is one of the principal dowries of this kingdom of Great Britain) is great; both because most of the kingdoms of Europe are not merely inland, but girt with the sea most part of their compass; and because the wealth of both Indies seems in great part but an accessory to the command of the seas.'

Bacon here dwells upon the advantage of sea-power, upon its relation to 'The True Greatness of Kingdoms and Estates,' and this he does with rare insight and pregnancy. But he does not seize, or at any rate he does not press, the point that, whereas sea-power is an advantage to all kingdoms capable of wielding it, it is only to a kingdom and an empire situated as England and her Empire are situated, that it is an absolute necessity. Here then we see the true relation between the ancient sovereignty of the seas and the modern command of the sea. The sovereignty of the seas was the symbolical expression of England's insular position. The command of the sea is the strategical expression of England's Imperial expansion. Our ancestors knew that except by sea the enemies of England could never reach her. They knew also that her soil had never been invaded except when she was unable to overthrow her foes at sea. They never doubted the truth of what Raleigh puts so quaintly, and withal so forcibly, when he says, 'To entertain those that shall assail us, with their own beef in their bellies, and before they eat of our Kentish capons, I take to be the wisest way.' All this they expressed in their claim to the sovereignty of the seas. We express the same idea in a different way when we insist that the existence of the Empire depends on the capacity of England to secure and maintain the command of the sea. The difference is that the sovereignty of the sea was a continuing claim, always symbolically asserted in time of peace, but not always strategically sustained in time of war; whereas the command of the sea is purely a strategical conception, dormant and inoperative in time of peace, but acquiring a vital meaning the moment war is declared.

What is this meaning? The command of the sea means z 2 freedom

freedom of military transit in the first place, of commercial transit in the second. The latter is implied in the former as the greater includes the less, Freedom of commercial transit can never be more than precarious until freedom of military transit has been secured, and when that is secured commercial transit becomes as free as is compatible with a condition of maritime war. Hence it is strictly true to say that command of the sea means freedom of military transit, or, in still more general terms, strategic freedom of transit. The sea in itself is a barren territory. It is not coveted for itself by any Power, civilized or uncivilized. Its only commercial or material value is that of its fisheries, and these belong for the most part to its territorial regions, and not to its broad strategical expanse. But the political and strategical value of the sea is its value as a highway. If it could not be traversed by ships, no Power would seek to command it. If it could not be traversed by British ships, the British Empire would cease to exist.

Furthermore, for the British Empire to continue to exist not only must the sea be traversed by British ships, but in time of war it must be commanded by British ships. Strategic freedom of transit must be secured in order that commercial freedom of transit may be maintained. For England to surrender the command of the sea in time of war would mean two things. It would mean on the one hand that England itself was liable to invasion, and on the other that every transmarine portion of the British Empire was open to military assault; and as a consequence of this it would mean further that the maritime commerce of the Empire had ceased to exist, No other great Power of the world is exposed in the same degree to these extreme consequences. To any other Power the obtaining of the command of the sea as against England can only be a means to an end, that end being the overthrow of the British Empire. To England it is and must be an end in itself, that end being the highest of all political ends for a nation; namely, the maintenance of the national existence. If we lost the command of the sea beyond recovery, we might not be immediately invaded, but the bonds of Empire would ipso facto be sun-We might avert invasion by concession; but assuredly no concession short of a dismemberment, or even a dissolution of the Empire, would satisfy an enemy who had finally vanquished us at sea. It is thus no rhetorical expression, but a plain statement of essential fact, that by the Navy we must stand or fall. To all other Powers a strong navy is more or less of a luxury, useful for certain subordinate purposes, the chief of

which is to act as a counterpoise to the maritime supremacy of England. To England alone, it is from the very nature of the case an absolute and primordial necessity. If no other nation maintained a single warship in commission, England must still hold sufficient command of the sea to secure the communications of the Empire. That condition being satisfied, the superior limit of the naval strength necessary to her security is determined from time to time by the naval strength of her neighbours and possible enemies. Its inferior limit is determined once for all, independently of all comparison with foreign Powers, by the insular position of the kingdom and the world-

wide character of the Empire,

Having thus shown that command of the sea means in a strategic sense complete freedom of maritime transit, military and commercial, we may next consider how such freedom is to be secured and maintained. We saw in the programme of the Manœuvres of 1893 that the criterion of command of the sea was held to be the practicability of sending a large expedition across it. Before he was empowered to report that he had gained the command of the sea in this sense, the Red Admiral was required either to have defeated the Blue fleets or to have compelled them to retire to a distance to avoid an engagement, and to have destroyed the Blue torpedo-boats, or at least to have reduced them to inactivity. In other words, the command of the sea is in this case taken to mean the destruction, or at least the complete neutralization, of any organized naval force capable of interfering with an enemy's freedom of transit. This is the true and only legitimate sense of the words. In no other way is it possible to establish that strategic freedom of maritime transit which is the final cause of all naval warfare. As a matter of fact, for reasons which need not to be examined here, the Red Admiral in the late Manœuvres never gained command of the Irish Channel in this sense. At no time during the period of 'hostilities' would it have been possible for a large expedition to be sent across from England to Ireland in the conditions assumed to be prevailing, of war between the two countries, the shores of Ireland being guarded by a powerful and undefeated fleet. On the contrary, so far from the Red Admiral being able to report that he had gained the command of the sea, he was not even able to prevent the Blue Admiral from claiming the exact reverse. Having swept the Irish Channel from end to end and found no trace of the main force of his adversary, Admiral Fitzroy, in command of the Blue fleets, telegraphed to the Admiralty in the following terms: 'I consider that I have command of the Irish Sea, and that no expedition expedition can cross it.' With all respect for a very distinguished naval officer, we must express the opinion that this was a gratuitous misreading of a very important principle of naval warfare. It confounded the condition of a disputed command with that of an assured command of the sea. It is true that the Red Admiral was not in a position to defeat the Blue fleets, nor to compel them to retire to a distance in order to avoid an engagement. So far he himself had failed to secure the command of the sea, and assuredly in such circumstances no expedition could have been sent across it. The latter part of Admiral Fitzroy's telegram was therefore perfectly correct, but, except in this sense, he had no more secured the command of the sea than his adversary had. He had denied to his adversary that strategic freedom of transit which constitutes command of the sea, but he had failed to secure it for himself. He had not defeated the Red fleets, nor compelled them to retire to a distance in order to avoid an engagement; and this criterion, applied by the Admiralty to the Red fleets, applied with equal force to his own. The very circumstances which made it impossible for the Red side to send an expedition across the Irish Sea, would have made it equally impossible for the Blue side to send an expedition across in the opposite direction, or to carry out any important naval enterprise against the coasts of its adversary. The presence on either side of an undefeated naval force within striking distance rendered the despatch of any such expedition reciprocally impossible. There was no command of the sea on either side, but the exact negation of it on both sides.

This point will well repay further examination and elucidation. It raises the most fundamental issue of all naval warfare. When we say that England must secure the command of the sea, we do not merely mean that she must render invasion impossible. That is only the negative side of the matter. The positive side is that she must secure her own freedom of maritime transit. In truth, no command of the sea is necessary to secure immunity from invasion. That is secured by the mere existence of the British fleets so long as they are undefeated. But their mere existence, even in what Raleigh calls 'equal or answerable strength' to the fleets of an enemy, does not confer upon them the command of the sea. It is certain that no invasion of these islands will ever be attempted until the fleets which defend them have first been defeated and virtually destroyed. It will not suffice merely to 'decoy' them away, as some people think was done when Nelson followed Villeneuve to the West Indies. No capable commander would allow allow himself to be 'decoyed' away, and no fleet could be decoyed away to such a distance that it would be impossible for it to return in time to frustrate the invader's purpose. Napoleon knew this perfectly well, deficient as he was in many respects in what a French naval historian has called 'le sentiment exact des difficultés de la marine.' He never pretended to think that his scheme of invasion was rendered feasible by the fact that Nelson had followed Villeneuve to the West Indies. Nelson, he knew, was away, but he did not know at what moment he might return. But if Nelson had encountered Villeneuve across the Atlantic and there suffered defeat, and if, at the same time, Ganteaume had been able successfully to try conclusions with Cornwallis off Brest, then, and not till then, might the Boulogne expedition have been launched with some prospects of success. But Villeneuve, closely followed by Nelson, returned across the Atlantic and finally put into Cadiz without striking the decisive Then Napoleon knew that his scheme of invasion had failed, because it was no longer possible for him to secure that strategic freedom of transit which was indispensable to its success. Accordingly, two months before the Battle of Trafalgar was fought he turned his arms against Austria, and abandoned once for all his plans for the invasion of England.

Here we see once more, in the light of the greatest naval crisis of our modern history, what is really meant by the command of the sea. The command of the sea was necessary to the success of Napoleon's designs, and because he failed to secure it his designs were irretrievably frustrated. The history of the Armada and its defeat teaches exactly the same lesson. An invincible fleet was to overpower the British naval defence, and to cover the descent upon our shores of Spanish troops massed in Flanders for the purpose. But the Armada was defeated, and the contemplated invasion was thereby rendered impossible; and generally it may be asserted, without fear of contradiction, that no military enterprise across the sea is practicable until complete command of the sea has first been secured by the defeat or disablement of all organized naval force capable

of disputing the passage.

of

 \mathbf{d}

is

le

er

re

es

rt

d

is

8

f.

0

s

h

n

r

t

n

t

'The command of the sea, then, means the possession of an invincible fleet which has gained so decisive a victory, or series of victories, as to render hopeless any renewal of the struggle against it. The territories of the Power having the command of the sea are virtually safe against attack by the sea, and the territories of a Power which possesses any fighting fleet at all are unlikely to be attacked until its fleet has been defeated or destroyed. Any Power aiming at attack upon territory across the sea must endeavour first to obtain

command of the sea, that is, to destroy the fleet of its enemy, and any operation against territory undertaken without this preliminary will be hazardous and uncertain.'*

We are now in a position to determine whether Admiral Fitzroy was justified the other day in stating that he had gained the command of the Irish Channel. Assuredly he was not. Nelson might just as well have said that he had gained the command of the sea when, having pursued Villeneuve to the West Indies and back again, he saw him retire to Cadiz without having attempted to join hands with Ganteaume. But Nelson knew better. It is true that he had completely frustrated Napoleon's design of invasion; that is, he had deprived Napoleon of all prospect of securing for himself the command of the But until Trafalgar had been fought and won, the command of the sea was in dispute, and therefore virtually in abeyance. There is no such thing as a partial or incomplete command of the sea; it is either absolute, or it does not exist. An Admiral who commands an undefeated fleet, even though it is inferior to its immediate adversary, can always frustrate a serious territorial attack on the country he serves, so long as he can avoid a decisive engagement. But he has no command of the sea himself until he has defeated or disabled the naval forces of his enemy.

The annals of naval warfare abound in illustrations of this paramount and fundamental principle. Two such illustrations, those of the Armada and of Napoleon's projected invasion of England, have already been incidentally mentioned. Napoleon's invasion of Egypt and the disastrous enterprise of Persano at Lissa are two other cases in point. The command of the sea is what every naval Power must aim at in all naval operations which are not purely defensive; and no Power can defend any of its transmarine possessions, except so far as they are capable of local defence, against an adversary who holds the command of the sea. 'An attack on land conducted across the sea,' say the writers already quoted,

'is a most hazardous speculation so long as there exists anywhere a hostile fleet that is able to fight. In order to make such an attack safe, it is indispensable that the attacker should secure himself from all interruption by destroying or driving from the sea any hostile fleet. The Power which should succeed in doing this would have "the command of the sea" against its particular enemy, and could then undertake in any part of the sea any operations desired.'

^{* &#}x27;Imperial Defence.' By Sir Charles W. Dilke and Spenser Wilkinson.

The history of these islands presents two noteworthy cases, in one of which the principle here represented as indefeasible would appear to have been successfully defied, while in the other it was certainly misapprehended by those who directed the defence of the kingdom. Each of these cases will repay a somewhat close examination. The first is the recovery of Britain for the Roman Empire by Constantius, at the close of the third century, after the revolt and death of Carausius. The other is the Battle of Beachy Head and the strategical situation involved in it, which has been so curiously misapprehended by nearly all historians, and has even baffled the sagacity of such a master of the philosophy of naval warfare as Captain Mahan. By making himself master of the Roman fleet, collected at Boulogne for the chastisement of German pirates, Carausius, a daring but treacherous seaman, succeeded in wresting Britain from the Roman Empire, and governed it for ten years as an independent dominion. More than one attempt was made by Rome to overthrow the usurper and recover his dominions for the Empire; but for a long time he held Boulogne, and once at least he defeated a Roman fleet at sea. Finally he was murdered by his minister Allectus; 'and the assassin,' says Gibbon,

'succeeded to his power and his danger. But he possessed not equal abilities either to exercise the one, or to repel the other. He beheld with anxious terror the opposite shores of the continent, already filled with arms, with troops, and with vessels; for Constantius had very prudently divided his forces, that he might likewise divide the attention and resistance of the enemy. The attack was at length made by the principal squadron, which, under the command of the Prefect Asclepiodotus, an officer of distinguished merit, had been assembled at the mouth of the Seine. So imperfect in those times was the art of navigation, that orators have celebrated the daring courage of the Romans who ventured to set sail with a side wind, and on a stormy day. The weather proved favourable to their enterprise. Under the cover of a thick fog they escaped the fleet of Allectus, which had been stationed off the Isle of Wight to receive them, landed in safety on some part of the western coast, and convinced the Britons that a superiority of naval strength will not always protect their country from foreign invasion.'

This reads, at first sight, like a direct negation of the principle which we have represented as indefeasible, the principle that the command of the sea is an indispensable condition of successful territorial attack. But the story told by Gibbon appears to be incomplete, and its incompleteness goes far to vitiate the historian's comment upon it. In the first place, it is plain that whatever may have been the case with Carausius.

Carausius, Allectus, his murderer and successor, was regarded by the people of Britain as a mere usurper. There is no evidence that he inspired any impulse of national defence, or that even his Roman subjects were faithful to him. In the second place, Gibbon tells us nothing of what became of the superior fleet of Allectus which Asclepiodotus is represented as successfully evading. It appears to have vanished out of existence, and probably after the death of Allectus, who was defeated and slain in an engagement with the troops of Asclepiodotus, either it was disbanded or it returned to its Roman allegiance. At any rate, it does not appear to have attempted to dispute the passage of Constantius, who set out from Boulogne as soon as he heard of the victory of Asclepiodotus and the death of Allectus. 'When Constantius landed on the shores of Kent,' says the historian, 'he found them covered with obedient subjects. Their acclamations were loud and unanimous, and the virtues of the conqueror may induce us to believe that they sincerely rejoiced in a revolution which, after a separation of ten years, restored Britain to the body of the

Roman Empire.'

We are accordingly by no means disposed to admit that the success of Asclepiodotus and the recovery of Britain by the Roman arms were calculated to convince the Britons, then or thereafter, 'that a superiority of naval strength will not always protect their country from a foreign invasion.' The fleet which failed to protect them was not a national fleet, but a revolted fleet of their conquerors, and the so-called 'foreign invasion' was manifestly regarded by many of them as a not unwelcome return of rulers whom they were prepared to obey. Even so the superior fleet of Allectus, if it was still 'in being,' to borrow the immortal phrase of Torrington, whose case will shortly engage our attention, must have impeded the transit of Constantius and threatened the communications of Asclepiodotus. As it did neither, it is safe to conclude that it was not really 'in being.' In other words, Asclepiodotus, though he had not defeated the fleet of Allectus, had virtually wiped it out of existence. For all practical purposes he had secured the command of the sea. In truth, the whole history of the revolt of Carausius, and its sequel in the overthrow of Allectus, is a signal illustration of the strategical advantage which belongs to command of the sea. Carausius, having first made himself master of the Roman fleet which commanded the Channel, had no difficulty whatever in making himself master of Britain. There he defied the whole power of the Roman Empire until the Romans had constructed a fresh fleet capable of wresting the command of the Channel from the usurper himself, or from his successor. It is true that Asclepiodotus succeeded in landing his troops in Britain without first disposing of the fleet of Allectus; but that the fleet of Allectus was in the end effectually disposed of is proved by the unmolested transit of Constantius, and his complete success in re-establishing the

sway of Rome throughout the land.

ed

no

or

he

1e

be

of

23

of

ts

re

ıt

18

e

d

d

0

r

e

e

r

t

ì

We turn now to a period of the national history just fourteen centuries later than that which has just engaged our attention. Once in the intervening period was England successfully invaded by William the Conqueror, and once was a threatened conquest averted by the failure of the Spanish Armada to secure the necessary command of the sea. The strategical conditions involved in the defeat of the Armada have already been incidentally noted, and it would not be uninteresting, if space permitted, to consider at some length why it was that William the Conqueror succeeded where the Spanish monarch failed.* But we pass over these cases in order to examine in detail an episode in our naval history which illustrates more than any other the signal failure of our country's historians to appreciate maritime affairs. The Battle of Beachy Head, fought on June 30, 1690, by the English and Dutch fleets under Torrington and Evertsen respectively against a superior French fleet under Tourville, has commonly been represented by historians as one of the most disastrous and even disgraceful events in all the annals of the British Navy. 'There has scarcely ever been so sad a day in London,' writes Macaulay, 'as that on which the news of the Battle of Beachy Head arrived. The shame was insupportable; the peril was imminent.' In truth, the shame was great; but it was, or should have been, that of those who, at a great crisis in the national fortunes, had not provided the nation's defenders at sea with a force sufficient to overcome the forces of the enemy. It was not that of the great strategist who saved his country by the sacrifice of his own immediate reputation, and at the risk of going down to posterity as a mere incapable, if not as a traitor and a poltroon. The peril was imminent; but if Torrington had listened to the politicians who controlled him and not to his own masterly strategical instincts, the case

^{* &#}x27;The invaders crossed an undefended sea, and found an undefended coast.'
This was because, as the same writer says, 'a formidable English fleet, which by
King Harold's orders had been cruising in the Channel to intercept the
Normans, had been obliged to disperse temporarily for the purpose of refitting
and taking in fresh stores of provisions.' (Creasy, 'Fifteen Decisive Battles.')
Practically, therefore, the defending fleet was non-existent at the time of the
Norman Conquest.

would have been one, not of imminent peril, but of irretrievable disaster. Few indeed of our great naval heroes deserve to stand higher in the esteem of their countrymen of all ages than Arthur Herbert, Earl of Torrington. His was the rare fortitude of a Fabius, 'Unus qui nobis cunctando restituit rem.' Victory was impossible to him, and his sense of duty forbade him seek a glorious death and an undying fame in defeat. He so fought as to save his country and to ruin his own reputation, Public opinion clamoured for his life, and insisted on his being sent to the Tower. William III., who was doubly indebted to him for his crown and throne, cashiered him from the naval service, refused to listen to his defence, visited several members of the court-martial which tried and acquitted him with heavy pains and penalties, and broke no less than forty-two officers of the navy, who, as Entick puts it, 'appeared to justify the Earl's courage and conduct.' The utmost that the great Whig historian can say in his favour is that

'there is a higher courage of which Torrington was wholly destitute. He shrank from all responsibility, from the responsibility of fighting, and from the responsibility of not fighting; and he succeeded in finding out a middle way which united all the inconveniences which he wished to avoid. He would conform to the letter of his instructions; yet he would not put everything to hazard. Some of his ships should skirmish with the enemy; but the great body of his fleet should not be risked.'

All this is true; but the high strategical reasons which governed Torrington's conduct are entirely ignored by the historian. Let us closely consider the situation. The country was divided between the partisans of James and the supporters of William. James was in Ireland, where his strength was greatest, and William had gone thither to encounter him, his transit having been covered by a small squadron of six men-ofwar in St. George's Channel under the command of Sir Cloudesley Shovel. The central Government was vested in Mary as Regent, assisted by a council of nine, among whom was Nottingham, Torrington's personal enemy, and Russell, his professional rival. The army was with William in Ireland, and Great Britain could only be defended on land by a hastily levied militia. Its sole effective defence, as always, was the fleet; and the fleet was, for the moment, insufficient to defend it. The chief reliance of James was upon the friendship, and the forces, naval and military, of Louis XIV. Here was a case in which, beyond all others, the security of England against insurrection at home and invasion from abroad depended on the sufficiency and

le

to

in le

ry

m

80

n.

g

ol

y

of

s

and capacity of her fleets to maintain the command of the sea. Louis XIV. resolved to make a determined effort to wrest this command from his hated adversaries, and by overpowering the English fleet in the Channel to open the way for a successful invasion and a successful insurrection to follow. A great fleet was collected at Brest under the supreme command of Tourville, and a squadron from Toulon under Château-Renaud was ordered to join him in the Channel. The intention was to sweep the Channel, to threaten London, so as to foment a saccept insurrection in the capital, to land troops in Torbay, and to occupy the Irish Channel in such force as to prevent the return of William and his army.

All this might have been foreseen, and indeed was foreseen by Torrington if by no one else, and, being foreseen, the whole scheme might have been frustrated by naval preparations equal to the emergency. In those days ships were so ill-built that fleets could not keep the sea in the winter; but the designs of Louis were known and foreseen in the preceding winter, when there would still have been time to take measures for defeating Torrington himself had foreseen the emergency, and entreated those responsible for the strength of the Navy to provide adequately against it. Up to the preceding autumn he had himself been First Commissioner of the Admiralty; but he surrendered his post, accepting a command afloat, rather than remain responsible for a state of things of which he clearly saw the danger. Macaulay represents him as having been dismissed as a consequence of an enquiry into the administration of his office, which resulted in the discovery of gross corruption and malversation :-

'No censure was passed on the chief offender, Torrington; nor does it appear that a single voice was raised against him. He had personal friends in both parties. He had many popular qualities. Even his vices were not those which excite public hatred. The people readily forgave a courageous open-handed sailor for being too fond of his bottle, his boon companions, and his mistresses, and did not sufficiently consider how great must be the perils of a country of which the safety depends on a man sunk in indolence, stupefied by wine, enervated by licentiousness, ruined by prodigality, and enslaved by sycophants and harlots.'

These are the florid colours with which Macaulay loads his palette. This is the portrait he draws of the man whom his countrymen down to the time of the Battle of Beachy Head continued to regard as the most capable seaman of his time, and whom his brother officers acquitted after the battle, even in the teeth of an exasperated and vindictive public opinion. It

does not seem to have occurred to the historian that Torrington may have escaped censure because he was not to blame. It is true that he was removed from the Admiralty, and his namesake and kinsman, Thomas Herbert, Earl of Pembroke, was appointed in his place. But this seems to have been done at his own urgent request, and for reasons entirely to his credit. He urged upon the Government that the preparations they proposed to make for meeting the expected attack of the French fleet were in his judgment insufficient; and finding his remonstrances unheeded, he declined to be responsible for a naval policy which he could not approve. The abuses discovered in the administration of the Admiralty do not seem to have been laid to his personal charge; and though it was deemed expedient to appoint a new Commission in which he had no place, he was immediately entrusted with the chief command at sea.

'Though he had been found an incapable administrator,' says Macaulay, 'he still stood so high in general estimation as a seaman that the Government was unwilling to lose his services. He was assured that no slight was intended to him . . . In an evil hour for England, he consented to remain at the head of the naval force on which the safety of our coasts depended.'

So history is written. Yet a consideration of facts and dates seems to afford a strong presumption that Torrington could, in any case, have been only technically responsible for the abuses discovered at the Admiralty. The Board of Admiralty was only constituted at the beginning of 1689, and the date of the Gazette which contains the names of Torrington's colleagues is given by Macaulay as March 11. Early in April, or possibly before the end of March, Herbert, who was only created Earl of Torrington later in the year, was at sea with the fleet, arriving before Cork on April 17. He remained at sea, or at least in command of the fleet, until the end of August, when the fleet under his command was broken up for the winter. It was the bad victualling of this fleet which led to an enquiry. and it was on November 23 that the House of Commons, having by that time been informed of the result of the enquiry which had been conducted by the King in person at the Treasury, ordered the persons directly incriminated into the custody of the Serjeant-at-Arms. Shortly after this a new Board of Admiralty was appointed, Torrington being super-seded by Pembroke. It is hard to believe that Torrington, who was at sea almost continually from the time of his appointment at the Admiralty until the time when the enquiry was instituted, who must himself have furnished many of the grounds and materials

on

is

ke

ed

vn

ed

to

re

es

cy

he

id

to

as

ys

n

as

il

al

d

n

r

of

d's

l,

y

e

r

n

t

,

s,

e

V

0

materials for the enquiry, who was prematurely driven into winter-quarters in August because he was, as Entick says, 'in very bad want of beer,'* could ever have had any opportunity during his brief and interrupted term of office of showing whether he was a capable or an incapable administrator.

The presumption here suggested is converted into something like a certainty by Torrington's own words in his defence before the court-martial. He had repeatedly urged on Nottingham, the Secretary of State, that the fleet should be strengthened in view of the threatened attack of the French. Earlier, in the year 1690, a French fleet had appeared off Cork, and, had Torrington's warnings been heeded betimes, an English fleet should have been in a position to attack and destroy it, and thereby entirely to frustrate the subsequent enterprise of Tourville. On this Torrington remarks in his defence:—

'The late insult which some call a disgrace had not only been prevented, but the French put by the possibility, during the whole war, of setting any fleet to sea considerable enough to give us either care or trouble. What excuse can be made for it I do not well know; but I am sure it is not want of admonition: for I appeal to many concerned in it whether it was not foreseen and foretold several months before the descent of the French, and the time it was made. Lest any of these matters should be laid to my charge, I think it necessary to acquaint this honourable Court, that not seeing matters go so well in the Admiralty as I thought the service required, and that it was not in my power to prevent it, I humbly begged and obtained the King's leave to be dismissed from that Commission, and giving any further attendance at the Board; that since I could not prevent the mischief I might have no share in the blame . . . I am sure the noble Lord [Nottingham], whose province it is, has always by his discourse endeavoured to persuade me to a belief that the French would not come out with a considerable strength. And I appeal to him, whether I did not tell him, when I had urged many reasons for strengthening our fleet, which he only answered with "You will be strong enough for the French"; "My Lord, I know my business, and will do my best with what I have; but pray remember it is not my fault that the fleet is not stronger. I own I am afraid now in winter, whilst the danger may be remedied; and you will be afraid in summer when it is past remedy." I could say more upon this subject, had I not confined myself to this year.'

^{*} The mention of beer is not without interest. It was almost the only beverage which the seamen of the time and for long afterwards could get at sea. The means of storing water were so inadequate that it was generally undrinkable after a few days at sea, and beer was issued in place of it, being also regarded as a preventive of sourvy in the days before limejuice was obtainable. Lord Hawke's 'Memoirs' are full of references to beer, and of complaints of the quality of the beer supplied to the service in his time.

It appears from this that Torrington himself asked to be dismissed from the Board of Admiralty, not because he acknowledged his responsibility for administrative crimes, with which he could have had very little to do, and from which he personally suffered, but because he would not be responsible for a state of things which he regarded as menacing to the security of the kingdom. 'I know my business, and will do my best with what I have'—there spoke the true spirit of the British Navy. 'You will be strong enough for the French'—there spoke the light heart of the British politician. The seaman was right, and the minister was wrong. But it was the seaman who was punished for strategy which saved the kingdom, while the minister, whose counsel would have lost it, has ever since

remained in possession of the ear of history.

However, Torrington had to make the best of a situation of which he had foreseen and deplored the perils. Let us see how he did it. Early in the year a fleet of sixteen sail-of-the-line under Admiral Killigrew had been sent in charge of a convoy to Cadiz, with orders to prevent, if possible, the exit of the Toulon fleet from the Mediterranean, and to follow it up should it effect its escape. This was good strategy in the abstract, but questionable in view of the comparative weakness of the English fleet. In its consequences it was disastrous, for Killigrew, delayed by weather, and by the many pre-occupations, commercial and strategical, involved in his instructions, was unable either to bar the passage of the Toulon fleet or to keep in strategical touch with it during its progress towards the Channel. Hence Château-Renaud was able to effect his junction with Tourville unmolested; while Killigrew did not reach Plymouth until after the Battle of Beachy Head had been fought, when, the French fleet being temporarily supreme in the Channel, he was compelled to carry his squadron into the Hamoaze so as to be out of harm's way. The only other important British force afloat was Sir Cloudesley Shovel's squadron, which had escorted the King to Ireland, and, having done so, received orders to join Torrington. But Tourville, being by this time in the Channel, was gradually forcing Torrington to the eastward. Hence, although fully alive to the strategical value, in certain contingencies, of these outlying squadrons of Killigrew and Shovel, Torrington was compelled to rely mainly on the force under his immediate command, the insufficiency of which he had many months before pointed out and strenuously insisted upon.

The great but inadequate fleet which Torrington was to command was slowly assembled in the Downs, and Torrington

ioinec

be

W-

ch

lly

of

he

th

he

ıt,

as

he

ce

of

w

te

a

it

P

e

S

r

-

,

0

s

8

t

f

9

)

joined it on May 30, his instructions having been signed on the 26th, and delivered to him on the 29th.* Even then the Dutch fleet had not reached the rendezvous in the numbers promised; and more than three weeks later, when Torrington, who had by this time carried his fleet to St. Helen's, wrote to Nottingham, on June 23, to announce Tourville's advance, he said, 'We have but eighteen Dutch with us, after all De Witt's great promises.' The entrance to the Channel was totally unguarded, and no scouts had been sent out to the westward. But this, though attributed to Torrington as a gross piece of neglect, was not his fault. His ships, insufficient in numbers at the best, were otherwise employed; and the Dutch, to whom he had entrusted the duty of scouting, had neglected it. Hence, on June 23, the first certain intelligence he received of the advance of the French was the information that they were anchored in great force in Compton Bay on the western side of the Isle of Wight. Three days afterwards, on June 26, he wrote to Nottingham to report that, his force having been strengthened in the meanwhile by the arrival of Evertsen with a reinforcement of Dutch ships, he, with fifty-five men-of-war and twenty fireships, had attempted to bring the French to an action, but that the French Admiral, though superior in force, had declined the engagement. Torrington very soon perceived that his tactics, in thus seeking to take the offensive, were ill-judged and based on a mistaken estimate of the enemy's force; and he lost no time in summoning a council of war and deciding on a more prudent line of action. He was face to face with a hostile force so superior to his own that he could not hope to win a decisive action. He might fight and be beaten, but he knew that to be beaten in such circumstances. was not merely to lose a battle, but to imperil the safety of the kingdom and the stability of the throne. Hence he decided, in unanimous concert with his colleagues, English and Dutch, of flag-rank, to act on the defensive. A defensive strategy is not congenial to English naval traditions, nor easily rendered intelligible to a nation accustomed to assert its undisputed supremacy at sea. But in the circumstances in which Torrington found himself, by no fault of his own and in spite of his repeated warnings, it was the only strategy capable of retrieving an almost desperate situation. No more masterly exposition of the true principles and bearings of such a strategy

Vol. 177.—No. 354.

^{*} These dates are important, because one of the charges made against Torrington was that he delayed to assume the command. 'I was,' he says, 'commanded to stay for my instructions.'

has ever been penned than Torrington hastily jotted down in his immortal despatch to Nottingham on June 26, 1690:—

'I do acknowledge my first intention of attacking them a rashness that will admit of no better excuse than that, though I did believe them stronger than we are, I did not believe it to so great a degree. . . . Their great strength and caution have put soberer thoughts into my head, and have made me very heartily give God thanks they declined the battle yesterday; and indeed I shall not think myself very unhappy, if I can get rid of them without fighting, unless it may be upon equaller terms than for the present I can see any prospect of. I find I am not the only man of that opinion; for a council of war I called this morning unanimously agreed, we are by all manner of means to shun fighting with them, especially if they have the wind of us; and retire, if we cannot avoid it otherwise, even to the Gunfleet, the only place we can with any manner of probability make our party good with them in the condition we are in. We have now had a pretty good view of their fleet, which consists of near if not quite eighty men-of-war fit to lie in a line and thirty fireships; a strength that puts me besides hopes of success, if we should fight, and really may not only endanger the losing of the fleet, but at least the quiet of our country too; for if we are beaten, they, being absolute masters of the sea, will be at great liberty of doing many things they dare not attempt while we observe them, and are in a possibility of joining Vice-Admiral Killigrew, and our ships to the westward. If I find a possibility, I will get by them to the westward to join those ships; if not, I mean to follow the result of the council of war. In the meantime I wish there might be speedy orders given to fit out with speed whatever ships of war are in the river of Chatham; and that the ships to the westward proceed to Portsmouth; and from thence, if the French come before the river, they may join us over the flats. This is the best advice I can give; but had I been believed in the winter, the kingdom had not received this insult.'

So wrote the greatest seaman of his age with a sagacity fully worthy of his consummate seamanship. The politicians in London, however, could not see the matter with his eyes. They persuaded themselves, and, still worse, they persuaded the Queen, that the French fleet which Torrington had reckoned as numbering at least eighty line of battleships had not really 'above sixty ships that could stand in a line.' They insisted that a battle was necessary, and seemed to think that a victory was possible. They would not see that a defeat would be fatal. Torrington had declared that he meant to watch the French without fighting them,—indeed, 'by all manner of means to shun fighting with them'; to get by them to the westward, and join the British ships in that quarter, if possible; but to observe them always, and 'retire, if we cannot avoid it otherwise, even

in

less

eve

ree.

hts

hey

self

nay

ect

l of ner

ind

un-

our

iad

iite

gth

llv

iet

ers

are

ind

ps;

the

ith

nat

ce,

ts.

he

lly

in

ey

he

as

ly

ed

al.

ch

ın

in

ve en

to

to the Gun-fleet,* the only place we can with any manner of probability make our party good with them in the condition we are in.' These are the true principles of a waiting, observing, defensive strategy. But the Queen and her Council in London would not hear of them. Some of them were for superseding Torrington. All were for insisting that a battle should be fought at once, and Torrington's plan of retiring, 'even to the Gun-fleet' if necessary, was peremptorily:negatived. 'So that upon the whole,' wrote Nottingham in a despatch, so hastily written that he had no time to take a copy of it,

'if you should retire to the Gun-fleet, the ships from Plymouth, if not joined with you, and Sir Cloudesley Shovel, and all the ships returning from Ireland, and Vice-Admiral Killigrew with that squadron, and a rich fleet of merchantmen will all be exposed to inevitable ruin. And, besides, the French may have opportunity of going with their whole fleet, or sending such part as they think fit to Scotland, where they are expected; and we have too good reason to apprehend disturbances.'

With this amazing despatch was enclosed a peremptory order from the Queen to fight at the first opportunity:—

'We apprehend,' Mary is made to say, 'the consequences of your retiring to the Gun-fleet to be so fatal, that we choose rather you should, upon any advantage of the wind, give battle to the enemy than retreat further than is necessary to get an advantage upon the enemy. But in case you find it necessary to go to the westward of the French fleet, in order to the better joining of our ships from Plymouth or any others coming from the westward, we leave it to your discretion, so as you by no means ever lose sight of the French fleet whereby they may have opportunities of making attempts upon the shore, or in the rivers of Medway or Thames, or get away without fighting.'

Between Torrington's despatch, and the despatches of Mary and Nottingham, in reply there lies, as it seems to us, the whole right and wrong of naval strategy, the whole essence of what pertains to the command of the sea. On this point we can appeal, not indeed to Captain Mahan,† the greatest living authority on naval history, and one of the greatest authorities of all time on the broader issues of naval strategy,—for Captain

^{*} The Gun-fleet is an outlying bank off the coast of Essex, north of the Thames. In Torrington's days a large fleet could anchor in safety behind it. But the shifting of the sandbanks has now somewhat diminished its value as an anchorage.

[†] This essay is not, of course, directly a review of Captain Mahan's writings; but we have placed the titles of his two great works at its head because we desire thereby to acknowledge the immense profit and instruction we have derived from his masterly reading of naval history.

Mahan appears in this case to have taken his-history from Macaulay and Macaulay's authorities, and never to have examined Torrington's own defence,—but to an authority not unworthy to be ranked with Captain Mahan, that of Admiral Colomb, whose work on 'Naval Warfare' stands almost alone in our literature for its firm grasp of sound principle and its lucid exposition of illustrative fact. The following is Admiral Colomb's comment on Nottingham's despatch and its enclosure:—

'This would be a perverse enough misunderstanding of the situation and of Torrington's view of it, if it stood alone. But the nonsequitur of the enclosure almost takes one's breath away. Nottingham was in the main only repeating what Torrington had put in his mind, but with the inferences turned inside out. The importance of joining, or at least of securing the safety of Killigrew and Shovel, was the matter which dwelt in the foremost place in Torrington's mind, and his main effort, as sketched out, was the endeavour to join them. If he could not pass the French to the westward, but could keep in observation of them to the eastward, his colleagues would be safe enough. For if de Tourville should go west after them, Torrington would follow them up; if he should detach force sufficient for their destruction, he would weaken himself so much that Torrington might engage him at an advantage. It was just the same with regard to Scotland. If Torrington was forced back-in order to avoid a battle -to the Gun-fleet, the French could neither proceed to Scotland in full force nor send a detachment there. First, because they would be unable to shake off Torrington; and secondly, because if they weakened themselves by detaching, Torrington would fall on the remainder. The one thing certain, both from Torrington's words and Nottingham's, was that the French wished of all things for a general action with the odds in their favour, and this alone was sufficient to prescribe a refusal. The one point on which Nottingham could hang a grain of justification for the extraordinary enclosure which his letter contained, was his estimate of the relative forces watching each other. He assumed them nearly equal. Torrington and his brother Admirals, looking at both fleets when they so decided, were of opinion that the odds were too great to give reasonable hopes What right had any statesman or politician in London to treat as fallacious estimates of force so arrived at? But Nottingham did it; for his letter, written in such haste that he was unable to take a copy of it, enclosed a positive order from the Queen to Torrington to bring the French fleet to action.'

Then, after quoting Mary's order, the Admiral continues :-

'This order was, of course, Nottingham's, and its wrong-headedness may possibly show itself to the reader who has followed me thus far. There is no sign in it of an understanding of the possibly overwhelming consequences of a lost battle, for it assumes it to be a from

have

not.

niral

lone

lits

iral en-

tua-

non-

ham

ind,

oin-

was

nem.

p in

safe

gton

heir

ight

d to

l in

ould

hey

the

ords

or a

WAS

ham

sure

rces

gton

ded,

pes

don

ble

to

led-

me

bly

)e s

bad

bad thing to let the French "get away without fighting." Nottingham must have got it into his mind, and carried it into the mind of the Queen and her Council, that the well-tried Herbert and his colleague flag-officers were incompetent cowards, fearing a battle where there were at least fair chances of success, and nothing to follow defeat if it should come. But, as has often happened since, the statesman was found on the quarter-deck, and the rash blunderer at the seat of Government. There was absolutely nothing to be gained by a battle which could not possibly be a decisive victory, and over which from the great numbers engaged, and the limits placed on manœuvring by the character of the ships and the lightness of the wind, the Admirals could have no real control. A complete victory to the enemy, on the other hand, would, at the very least, have sent the Dutch king back to Holland, if it did not place this kingdom under the orders of the Pope and of Louis. The sailors saw it all well enough. The statesmen neither saw it then nor afterwards.

By the time the Queen's commands reached him, Torrington, avoiding an engagement, had been forced back by the French to the neighbourhood of Beachy Head. He replied at once to Nottingham, and briefly recapitulated his former reasoning; but with a true sailor's sense of discipline, he expressed his readiness to obey the orders given him. He insisted that he and his colleagues had rightly estimated the strength of the French, and urged that their tactics showed them to be conscious of their advantage:—

"If they do not think they have the advantage, I am yet to learn what can move them to stay, having for several days had a fair wind to take them off. And, my Lord, notwithstanding your advice from France, I take them to be eighty men-of-war strong . . . I cannot comprehend that Killigrew, the merchant ships, Shovel, or the Plymouth ships, can run much hazard if they take any care of themselves; for, whilst we observe the French, they cannot make any attempt either upon ships or shore, without running a great hazard; and if we are beaten, all is exposed to their mercy. "Tis very possible I reason wrong, but I do assure you I can and will obey. Pray God direct all for the best."

At daybreak on the morning after receiving his orders, Torrington drew his ships into line, the wind being light from the eastward; and at eight o'clock he made the signal for battle, the French fleet being at the time to leeward and awaiting the attack. The Dutch fleet occupied the van; Torrington commanded the centre, according to usage; and Delaval, his second in command, who afterwards presided at the courtmartial which tried and acquitted his chief, commanded the rear. The tactics of the battle, which have been much criticised, only concern us here so far as they illustrate the strategical policy

policy of Torrington. The Dutch from their position suffered most heavily, and this was subsequently made one of the grounds of accusation against Torrington, who was charged with not having duly supported his allies. But Torrington's object was to fight an action and not to suffer defeat. His orders, which were contrary to his own judgment, compelled him to fight, but they could not compel him so to fight as to lose his fleet. Had he seen his way to a decisive victory, he would have fought in a different fashion. There would have been no battle of Beachy Head, for the French would have been destroyed before even they weathered the Isle of Wight. Had the Queen's orders permitted him to avoid an action, in accordance with his own judgment and that of his colleagues, he never would have fought at all. As it was, all he could do was to fight so as not to be beaten, and this he did, although some of the ships under his command, especially those of the Dutch, were severely handled by the superior numbers of the French and their welldirected fire :-

'I am sure,' he said in his defence, 'that if I had acted otherwise than I did, the whole fleet had been ruined and I wholly inexcusable; for I had lost the wind, contrary to the results of the council of war, which was, that we should by all manner of means shun fighting the enemy, if they have the wind of us... Had I made one step towards losing the wind, I had not only acted contrary to the unanimous declared opinion of the council of war, but contrary to my own judgment, declared under my hand. What reflections that might have drawn upon me I humbly submit to the judgment of this honourable Court.'

Two conditions thus governed the whole tactics of the action; the direction of the wind and the superior numbers of the French. Had it been made a decisive action, it must have ended in a decisive defeat of the only fleet which stood between Great Britain and invasion. To make it an indecisive action it was necessary for the inferior fleet to retain the advantage of the wind, and this, in Torrington's judgment, could only be done by fighting as he did. Who shall say that he was wrong? Certainly those who tried him, being members of his own profession, recorded their conviction that he was right. Probably they knew as well as he did that the action never ought to have been fought, that it was bad strategy to fight it. But the strategy was Nottingham's; the tactics which averted its worst consequences, though they could not prevent its immediate results assuming the dimensions of a grave disaster, were Torrington's own. We have already quoted Macaulay's strange and misguided comment on these masterly tactics. Admiral Colomb fered

the

rged

ton's

ders.

ight.

fleet.

ught

e of

efore

ders

own

nave

not

nder

rely

rell-

wise

ble;

war,

the

step

animy

ight

this

on;

the

ave

een

ion

of

ne

g?

ro-

oly

ve

he

rst

ite

re

ge

al

ab

Colomb has reflected, in terms not too severe, on the perverse misunderstanding of the statesmen of the time; but surely the misunderstanding of the modern historian, not to speak of his positive misrepresentations, is even more astounding. We need only set against it the declaration of Torrington himself, a declaration sanctioned and endorsed by the unanimous judgment of the Court which tried and acquitted him:—

'I will not confine any man's judgment to mine, but I am very ready to reason the point of conduct with any man; but this I may be bold to say, that I have had time and cause enough to think of it; and that upon my word, were the battle to be fought over again, I do not know how to mend it, under the same circumstances.'

The battle lasted the whole day, and the Dutch ships suffered very severely. As the day advanced the wind dropped, and Torrington, observing this, and also that the set of the tide was against the French, first ordered the Dutch to anchor where they lay, and then, as Entick relates,

'with his own ship and several others he drove between them and the enemy, and anchored about five in the afternoon, at which time it was calm and the French fleet was driving away with the tide; however, judging it not safe to renew the fight at so great a disadvantage, he weighed anchor at nine in the evening and retreated to the eastward, taking advantage of the flood-tide.'

The next day a council of war was called, and resolved 'to endeavour to preserve the fleet by retreating, and rather to destroy the disabled ships, if they should be pressed by the enemy, than to hazard another engagement by protecting them.' Some few ships were sacrificed in this way, for the French pursued with some vigour at first, but in the end Torrington carried the bulk of his fleet into the Thames, where, in Macaulay's words, 'he ordered all the buoys to be pulled up, and thus made the navigation so dangerous, that the pursuers could not venture to follow him.'

The panic in London was great when the news of the disaster became known. The English people, who live by sea-power, have perhaps seldom fully realized the true conditions of the power by which they live. To them, in 1690, a reverse at sea was equivalent to the overthrow of their sea-power, and instant measures were taken for a hasty defence against the invasion which every one believed to be imminent. It would have been imminent if Nottingham's counsels had prevailed in the sense and to the extent which he desired. But Torrington had so managed matters that his fleet, although manifestly inferior to its adversary, still remained master of the strategic situation.

Tourville

Tourville could not defeat it, because he could not get at it; and, so long as it was undefeated, it completely frustrated all serious enterprise on his part. He never attempted to land in force. Having abandoned the pursuit of Torrington, the French retired to the westward, and, being compelled by stress of weather to anchor in Torbay, they made a hasty descent on Teignmouth, where the appearance of the local militia quickly scared them away, after they had destroyed two or three defenceless coasting vessels, and carried off a few sheep. 'And thus,' says Entick, oddly enough, 'were the great designs, both of the French and the discontented, entirely baffled by the vigilance of the Queen.' It was not the vigilance of the Queen, still less the sagacity of her counsellors, that baffled the enterprises of Tourville and the designs of Louis XIV., but the strategical insight of Torrington and the consummate skill with which he devised and applied a tactical remedy for the strategical blunders of Nottingham. Had he been allowed to follow his own counsel and that of his colleagues, and so avoid an engagement with Tourville until he could encounter him on equal terms, not a corporal's guard of the militia need have been set in motion. Tourville could have done nothing without first disposing of Torrington's fleet, and Torrington was resolved to give him no opportunity of doing so. Sooner or later the arrival of Killigrew and Shovel on the scene would have placed Tourville between two fires, and compelled him to fight in circumstances in which victory would have been more than doubtful, and defeat would have involved total destruction. Even as it was, with Torrington defeated and driven back, Killigrew and Shovel isolated and practically outside the field of operations, Tourville was completely baffled and returned to Brest, with nothing better to show for his enterprise than the laurels of a barren victory, and the booty of half-a-dozen sheep and two or three defenceless coasters. The comment of Torrington, here as elsewhere, goes straight to the root of the matter:-

'It is true, the French made no great advantage of their victory, though they put us to a great charge in keeping up the militia; but had I fought otherwise, our fleet had been totally lost, and the kingdom had lain open to an invasion. What then would have become of us in the absence of His Majesty and most of the land-forces? As it was, most men were in fear that the French would invade; but I was always of another opinion; for I always said, that whilst we had a fleet in being, they would not dare to make an attempt.'

In the whole chapter of naval strategy, theoretical and practical, there is no article more pregnant or more profound it:

all

and

the

ress

on

kly

ree

and

oth

the

the

fled

but

kill

the

to

oid

on

ive

th-

vas

or

ald

to

ore

n.

ck,

eld

to

he

en

of

he

y, ut

he

VO.

19

ut

ve

d

upon

in its significance than that which is embodied in this phrase of Torrington's-'a fleet in being.' A fleet in being, too large to be treated as une quantité négligeable by an adversary opposed to it, is an absolute bar to all serious enterprise, maritime or territorial, on the part of that adversary. Maritime enterprise on a large scale must necessarily involve a decisive engagement, and this of course the commander of the inferior fleet will do his best to avoid. Territorial enterprise, on the other hand, is, as we have seen, the one naval operation of all others which requires an undisputed command of the sea as a condition indispensable not merely to its success but even to its inception. 'Whilst we observe the French,' said Torrington, 'they cannot make any attempt either upon ships or shore, without running a great hazard.' In the armoury of military strategy there is no single weapon so potent as that of the fleet in being is in the armoury of naval strategy. The advance of an invading army into a hostile territory cannot be prosecuted in the face of an opposing force which bars the way to its objective, until that force has been defeated; a fortress unreduced which threatens its communications equally paralyses its advance. A fleet in being discharges both these functions at once. It is more mobile than an army; it is more difficult to reduce than a fortress; its passage from place to place leaves no trace behind; and, except by direct observation, neither easy to sustain nor difficult to baffle, its movements cannot be detected. Thus, as occasion serves, it can operate with equal effect either as a strategical bar to the advance of a hostile fleet, or as an unreduced fortress which threatens its communications and its rear; and it can do this, not at one place only, but wherever the movements and apparent designs of the enemy appear to offer a strategical opportunity or advantage.

It may be urged perhaps that these conditions and advantages apply with equal or even greater effect to the hostile naval force opposed to the fleet in being and assumed to be superior to it. But that is not so. The objective of a hostile fleet must be one of three things,—the principal naval force of its adversary, a detached naval force of its adversary, or some point of territory on which a landing can be effected. Whichever of the three Tourville had elected to pursue the strategy of Torrington provided an effective answer to his design. If Tourville forced him back, he would, while avoiding a battle, so order matters that his own fleet should be placed in a position at once of perfect safety and of commanding observation. If Tourville returned to the westward for the purpose of intercepting the squadrons of Killigrew and Shovel, Torrington would follow him and hover

upon his flanks and rear. It is true that it was no more difficult for Tourville to baffle observation in these circumstances than it would have been for Torrington in the contrary case. But while Torrington, being inferior to his adversary and desiring to avoid an engagement, would gain all he wanted by eluding observation, Tourville would gain little in any case, and, not knowing where Torrington was, would be paralysed for any serious offensive enterprise by the possibility that Torrington might appear in force at the critical moment. This applies still more strongly to the alternative of territorial attack. Hence, although the position in which Torrington found himself was one which no patriotic Englishman could ever regard without indignation and alarm, it appears to us to be indisputable that his strategy, as masterly in its conception as it was splendidly steadfast in its prosecution, was the only means whereby his country could be rescued from the perils which environed it.

It remains to consider the light thrown by the teaching of history and experience on the naval circumstances of our own time. We are not now in the days of the Armada or the Revolution, or even in the days of Nelson. Everything has changed in the materials and appliances of naval warfare since the last great naval struggle in which this country was engaged. To what extent have these changes affected the broad issues and conditions of naval strategy? The answer is, scarcely at all. Command of the sea, in the sense of strategic freedom of maritime transit, is now, as ever, the final cause of all naval warfare. With it, all things are possible which naval warfare can attain; without it, nothing is attainable. Let us consider the case of England being at war with such a combination of naval Powers, say France and Russia, as would be capable of seriously disputing her supremacy at sea. Such a war might and probably would in the long run be decided by strategical issues of the military order; but strategical issues of the naval order would, most undoubtedly, have to be decided first. The British fleets must be supreme at sea or the British Empire must fall to pieces. If it were solely a question of the defence of these islands against invasion, the example of Torrington shows undoubtedly that something less than the command of the sea might for a time suffice for our bare preservation. A 'fleet in being,' undefeated and able to avoid a decisive engagement, is an absolute bar to invasion across the sea. This is the true function of a fleet in the strategy of an inferior naval Power. There was no doubt of the superiority of the French to the German fleet in the war of 1870-71. Yet the German fleet, inferior as it was, and incapable of taking nore

um-

rary

and

by

ase,

vsed

that

This

ack.

self

out

that

idly his

ing

our

or

ing

fare

was

the

115,

gic

e of

val

us

om-

be

h a by

ues

ded

tish

the

or-

m-

va-

la

the

rity

Yet

ing the the sea against its rival, sufficed to debar France from making a serious military demonstration against Germany on the shores of the Baltic. But England has not merely her own shores to guard against invasion and insult. She has her Empire to Sea-power alone can do this, and command of the sea is the beginning and the end of sea-power. In the case supposed, no English strategist would think of attempting to invade the central territories either of France or of Russia. The first thought of an English strategist must be the adequate defence of England's transmarine possessions. France can attack none of these except across the sea; Russia can attack only one of them, the Indian Empire, by land, and this, like every other part of the Empire, even the British Isles themselves, must be defended on or across the sea. We should lose India sooner or later if our sea-power were overthrown. We could not retain a single one of our transmarine possessions, except by the forbearance of our enemies, if we lost the command of the sea.

Thus strategic freedom of maritime transit is the primary and indefeasible condition of the defence of the British Empire. Every fleet capable of impairing that freedom must either be defeated or 'contained' in the military sense; so blockaded, that is, that it cannot leave its port of shelter without fighting an action against a superior force. There are those who maintain that a blockade is impracticable in modern conditions of naval warfare; and they are probably, at least, so far right, that it is impossible so closely to blockade a port as completely to prevent the occasional and clandestine escape of individual ships. But a blockade at best is only a means to an end; the end being to bring the enemy to an action, or to nullify the strategical value of his force so long as he declines to fight. So long as that end is attained, therefore, the blockade is effectual for its purpose, notwithstanding the occasional and clandestine escape of individual ships. Only two courses are open to ships which thus break the blockade: either to engage individually in a guerre de course, a campaign of commerce-destroying, or, as some ingenious strategists have suggested, to proceed forthwith to some preconcerted rendezvous, there to constitute an organized fleet capable of acting on the offensive. Now, a guerre de course is always a vexatious incident of naval warfare, and often a very costly one to the naval Power attacked. But it has never yet sufficed by itself to determine the broad strategical issues of maritime conflict; and, according to Captain Mahan, it never can. It is even doubtful whether in these days of swift steam navigation it is likely to be so destructive as it was in the old sailing days. It is quite certain that it will never overthrow the strategical supremacy of a Power which holds the command of the sea; that can only be done by the suppression of the organized naval force, strategically distributed in sea-going fleets, which constitutes and embodies that supremacy. On the other hand, the enterprise of forming ships which have broken the blockade into an organized fleet capable of acting on the offensive is necessarily exposed to many hazards and perils. It amounts at best to a redistribution, not to an augmentation, of existing naval force; and the strategical answer to it is a corresponding redistribution of the forces of the superior adversary. may or may not be successful in the immediate issue; it can hardly fail in the long run. Evasion on a large scale may frustrate the purpose of a series of blockades, and compel the blockading fleets to concentrate. But command of the sea cannot be wrested from a superior naval Power by evasion; it can only be won by fighting. The idea that the evading fleet can engage in independent territorial enterprise of serious moment is purely chimerical; the 'fleet in being' forbids it. With a superior force at its heels or on its track fugitive raids are the utmost limit of its offensive capacity, and fugitive raids are of little or no strategical moment.

But, with the command of the sea once assured, the power of England to resist the assault of even so formidable a combination as that of France and Russia is almost unlimited. As against Russia, the ultimate problem would be mainly a military one, and this we are not concerned to discuss; it must suffice to say that, unless the naval problem is previously resolved in our favour, the military problem must be decided against us. But as against France the problem is from first to last purely a naval one. The command of the sea is not merely the tenure by which alone we hold the Empire. It is also the title, the indefeasible title, by which we can at any time claim the transmarine possessions of any European Power which cannot defeat us at sea. Every Power in the world holds all its transmarine possessions merely as the caretaker of the ultimate naval Power. If England is that Power, every such possession is hers for the trouble of taking it whenever she is at war with the Power which holds it. If she is not, her Empire is at an end, and her very existence as an independent nation must ever be at the mercy of her victorious foes. This, and no less than this, is the strategical meaning of the command of the sea. To the British Empire its possession means security, its loss annihilation.

To secure this priceless advantage at the outset of a war, and to maintain it to the end, is or should be the paramount pre-

occupation

ical

sea;

ized

hich

and,

cade

e is

unts

ting

ling

hat

can

nay

the sea

; it

leet

ous

it.

ids

ids

r of

om-

As

ary

e to our

But

y a

ure

the

ns-

feat

ine

ver.

the

wer

her

the the

ish

and

re-

ion

occupation of British naval policy. It is idle to increase our army, if our fleets are not supreme, and superfluous if they are. Those who talk loosely and longingly about universal military service as necessary to England's defence, might well be invited to consider whether universal naval service is not rather the counterpart, in the circumstances of the British Empire, of the universal military service imposed, by other circumstances and conditions, upon the Continental nations. Assuredly no military strength would save us if our naval strength were to fail. our naval strength sufficient to give us that strategic freedom of maritime transit which in time of war is the vital principle of the Empire? The present Chancellor of the Exchequer says it is; or rather what he does say is that 'the superiority of the British Navy was never so great as it is now.'* This is manifestly rather a numerical than a strategical estimate, a piece of optimism which would fain silence inconvenient criticism by ignoring the real conditions of the problem. The question is not whether our Navy is superior and far superior to any other-for, if it were not, the British Empire would not be worth a year's purchase—but whether it is so far superior to any probable combination of naval adversaries as to be incapable of losing the command of the sea except through the treachery, cowardice, or incapacity, all equally inconceivable, of men whom the nation trusts as implicitly as our forefathers trusted the great seamen of the past. To this question the Chancellor of the Exchequer's statement gives no reassuring answer, and the little comfort it contains was dissipated beforehand by the Secretary to the Admiralty, who hinted not obscurely in the same debate that Parliament and the nation would do well to look closely into the matter and insist on the maintenance of an adequate standard of naval defence. This significant Ministerial byplay is, in fact, a new version of the old dispute between Nottingham and Torrington. 'You will be strong enough for the French,' said Nottingham. 'The superiority of the British Navy was never so great as it is now, says Sir William Harcourt, while his colleague, who represents the Admiralty, only just refrains from asking for more ships. In the meanwhile the naval service may be trusted always to act in the spirit of Torrington's noble answer, 'My Lord, I know my business, and will do my best with what I have.' But the nation should reflect that whereas the supine optimism of Nottingham only went near to losing a kingdom, a similar spirit in these days must inevitably destroy an Empire.

^{* &#}x27;Times,' Aug. 29, 1893.

ART. III.—1. Annals of Winchester College, from its Foundation in the year 1382 to the present time. By T. F. Kirby, M.A., F.S.A., Bursar of Winchester College, formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. London and Winchester, 1892.

 Wykehamica. By the Rev. H. C. Adams, M.A., late Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford. Oxford, London, and Win-1878

chester, 1878.

 Life of William of Wyheham. By George Herbert Moberly, M.A., late Fellow of Corpus Christi College, Oxford. Winchester and London, 1893.

4. The Life of William of Wykeham. By Bishop Lowth.

London, 1759.

THE College of St. Mary Winton celebrated, on the 25th of July, 1893, the completion of the fifth century since its installation at Winchester. The ceremony was worthy of the occasion. The Heir Apparent and his royal brother the Duke of Connaught, the two Archbishops, the Bishop of Winchester as Visitor and Diocesan, the Bishops of London, Salisbury, Southwell, Truro, and many more, were present to do honour to the venerable but ever youthful institution, and to the memory of its Founder. It was a stately and an interesting spectacle. The religious ceremonies of the day began with an early celebration of the Holy Communion, and were resumed in a service held in the open air in 'Chamber Court'; where the Bishops, in their Convocation robes, gathered with the Wardens and other members of Wykeham's two foundations, and hundreds of old Wykehamists and other guests from the Universities and Public Schools, to receive the visit of the Primate, and to offer with him a prayer and hymn of thanksgiving. Not many times in the last five hundred years have the crosses of Canterbury and York and the crozier of Winchester met together. And it is only at the greatest State ceremonials that Church, represented by so many dignitaries, and State, in the persons of princes of the blood, present and past Lord Chancellors, judges, soldiers, and men of learning, come together to lend a present dignity to the memory of the past; with grave courtesies exchanged by the great personages, and stately processioning to the glorious Cathedral; to which, according to ancient usage, the Archbishop of Canterbury could only be admitted alone, at the west door, and by the Dean and Chapter. Thrones were placed in the Cathedral, crosses shone in the sunlight, the insignia of University and civic honour were displayed; and after hymns and anthems had been sung, all present listened to the eloquent sermon in which the Archbishop recalled the example of William of Wykeham to the memory of his sons, and bade them remember their Founder, and aim at that which distinguished him in all he did, the opus feliciter consummavit of the statesman and designer.

ion

Α.,

92.

ow

in-

ly,

in-

th.

5th

nce

of

the

in-

lis-

do

the

ing

an

ned

ere

the

ns,

the

the

S-

ars

ier

est

ni-

ent

ıg,

he

es,

ch,

ry

an

ses

ric

ad

ch

he

of

The religious ceremonies, which began the day, were followed by a secular festivity, graced by the presence of the Princes. There was a Latin oration ad Portas, according to ancient custom, a luncheon in Hall, Medal Speaking, a dinner with speeches in the Great Hall of the Castle, at which the Warden of New College, the senior Wykehamist present, showed himself the most graceful orator; and all ended with such a Domum as has never been heard within the memory of man, or perhaps of the old walls which echoed it. The great personages who came to do honour to Wykeham's College received honour themselves in doing so; and did homage in that name to five centuries of English history, centuries of political and social advance, well ushered in by the Prelate and Chancellor, the moderate politician and far-sighted Founder in whose name they came together.

Such pageantry is not commonly seen within the gray precincts of Wykeham's foundation; and the thought may have crossed the mind of some Wykehamist present at this stately show that such a display was out of harmony with the quiet spirit of the place. The feeling of esprit de corps, half patriotic, half domestic, which distinguishes Wykeham's sons, might have wished for a celebration reserved omnibus Wiccamicis alone. But on such an occasion as the present the rest of England claims a share in Winchester. She did right in calling all England to the feast. She had builded her house and furnished her table; and if for once she exchanged the russet garb of her daily life for a more sumptuous attire, she wore her silk and

purple bravely, and became it well.

It was, indeed, no idle commemoration of a single fact in history; for whereas ordinary centenaries are but notches in the calendar and aids to memory, we have in the quingentenary celebration of Winchester College the record of five centuries spent in the continued and consistent life of an institution standing on the old ways, yet open to new ideas, true to the far-sighted design of its Founder, yet changing with the times; and at this moment as much in harmony with present needs as the Marlboroughs and Cheltenhams, the Wellingtons and Cliftons, which were established but yesterday.

It is no small tribute to the good sense of the originator of the Public School system that his work has stood the test of a long experience. We may assume that William of Wykeham's

design

design was a development and not an invention; but as the Archbishop of Canterbury remarked in his sermon, 'Genius is accurate development'; that is, the designer must be judged by the stability of his work. Fonthill, erected in a moment of splendid caprice, falls in a night, and condemns its author: Winchester College, built of chalk and flint, and founded on piles driven into a marsh, serves its purpose in 1893 as well as five hundred years ago; ars probat artificem in the durability no less than the beauty of the design. A long line of successes has but confirmed the soundness of the original plan of the Founder, and it needs no artificial helps to keep his memory green. No other founder, perhaps, is so well remembered. Henry VI. is an interesting and pathetic figure. Edward VI. and Elizabeth have given their names to many institutions, to which they contributed little but their names and their royal bounty. The names of Clare, Pembroke, Stapleton, Merton, are lost in the mists of the Middle Ages; the founders of the fifteenth century, magnificent in their liberality, did but follow in their work the pattern already set, and had little personal connexion with the foundations which they established. John Lyon and Lawrence Sheriff are little else than venerable myths. Colet perhaps comes nearest of all Founders to the fatherly type which we honour in Wykeham; for he both founded and nursed St. Paul's School, and established it on a design of his own and to suit the needs of his time. But Wykeham was not content to leave his College to take care of itself. As he had found leisure in the midst of State affairs to design the buildings and compose the statutes of this College, so, from his neighbouring palace of Wolvesey, he watched over its growth for ten years, adding and improving where experience suggested change, and impressing his own character upon it.

It is a just tribute to this character that while the members of other and similar institutions are known by titles of place or dedication, the members and associates of this Society own to no other name than that of 'Wykehamist': and it is reasonable that in a survey of the history of Winchester College the portrait of the Founder should occupy the foremost place. And here we miss the guiding hand of Mr. Kirby, to whose unfailing industry and practised skill in deciphering, compiling, and arranging a vast mass of material into a body of 'Annals of Winchester,' all lovers of Winchester—and who that knows Winchester does not love it?—owe so much. Mr. Kirby has told us little about the Founder but what is contained in the documents which he has read in the College and Cathedral archives. The history of his life, beyond these facts,

rests partly on unverifiable tradition, partly on a few biographical notices of the Bishops of Winchester, and mainly on the general history of the times in which Wykeham lived and

was no unimportant actor.

1

e

e

e

e

S

n

8

e

g

n

S

T

st

5,

d

The birth and origin of William of Wykeham are obscurely One account states that he was infimo loco natus, another that his parents were honesti genere, but poor; and that he owed to patrons, not to them, his education at a school in or near Winchester; probably, Mr. Moberly thinks, the grammar school maintained by the Priory of St. Swithun, to whom the Cathedral belonged. We do not know whether the name by which the world knows him was a patronymic or a local appellation. His father is said to have been surnamed Longe. There is no evidence either that he was called Wykeham, or that his son ever bore the name of Longe. A century later, all Englishmen had surnames; a century earlier, comparatively few. We may judge from the character of surnames, which are for the most part personal, local, or professional, how they became by degrees fixed in families. Some light might be thrown on the question of his family by investigation of the arms borne by Wykeham. No royal grant or license exists allowing him to bear coat-armour; and as the science of armory was in its best days in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, the presumption would be rather in favour of his having inherited his arms. But it is also conjectured that he assumed these arms (or perhaps added chevrons or chevronels to roses) from humility, as recalling his trade of a builder; as the Bishop of Mainz took for the arms of his See the carter's wheel.* His kindred, who were numerous, would appear to have been of good standing among the lesser gentry.

Be this as it may, the lad, whether nobilis or ignobilis, and whether his patron was named Nicholas Uvedale, John de Scures, or Thomas Foxley, received some sort of education secularibus studiis, and not, as it would seem, according to trivium and quadrivium, or at the University, unless it was in 'the trivium of the theological and quadrivium of the cardinal virtues.' His education gave occasion to his enemies to cavil at the promotion to high dignity of one 'unlearned'—though he is allowed to have been learned in law, and a capable Chancellor—and to Wyclif among them, to carp at the making of bishops out of 'men skilled in building castles.'

^{*} These may be instances of the canting heraldry abhorred by the Baron of Bradwardine, but the arms may as well have reference to the trade as to the name. The history of heraldry is yet to be written.

The key to the early portion of his life may perhaps be found if we suppose that his secular training took the line partly of a knowledge of conveyancing and practical law, partly of the study and practice of architecture, not yet dissociated from the craft of freemasonry; and that he found early opportunity of perfecting his knowledge of that noble science in the works carried on by Edward III. at Winchester Castle, and in the rebuilding of the Cathedral begun by Bishop Edingdon, and finished later by Wykeham himself. It was in the character of an architect that he was introduced to the notice of the King, who gave him ample opportunity of showing in his service the practical acquaintance with details, and the business capacity and foresight, which may be observed not only in his great architectural works, but in the contracts, conveyances, statutes, and other documents running in his name. Every one knows the story of the Winchester Tower at Windsor, 'Hoc fecit Wykeham'; what is not so well known is the more solid fact that the whole of the eastern ward of Windsor Castle * was built under his direction, as well as the beautiful circular Castle of Queenborough (destroyed in 1650), parts of Leeds Castle, Porchester, St. Stephen's Chapel at Westminster, and other buildings.

William of Wykeham has the credit of having invented the Perpendicular style of architecture. The phrase has no meaning. Styles change by degrees and by a process of natural That which we call 'Perpendicular' was a result or a discovery rather than an invention, and took its rise, as Professor Freeman pointed out long ago, from the adaptation of flowing tracery to new conditions. When the idea of dividing the window space into sections was once conceived, the vertical principle came in of necessity. The main feature of Perpendicular architecture, the vertical line dividing the whole arch-space from sill to crown into separate sections, was introduced at Gloucester by Abbot Stanton, between 1340 and 1350, in the Choir; and the south aisle of the Minster was built ten years earlier. Of the other characters of the style. the four-centred arch t was used at an earlier date as convenience suggested; horizontal transoms are found in the domestic work of the thirteenth century, because window shutters required square frames; panelling, and other 'Perpendicular' features in Bishop Edingdon's work, both at

and part of the Cloisters.

† Wykełam, like the architect of Eton chapel, generally preferred the twocentred arch, whether equilateral or depressed.

^{*} Perhaps also the Round Tower, also called la Rose and the Round Table, and part of the Cloisters.

d

ie

e

of

23

d

ρf

ie

y

at

s,

S

it

ct

LS

le

e,

le

1-

al

r

LS

of

ıl

r-

le

LS

d

15

1-

e

W

-

t

e,

o-

r

Winchester and in the town from which he took his name; * fan-tracery at Gloucester, and in St. Stephen's Chapel at Westminster, attributed to Edingdon; the use of the double ogee curve in mouldings, of polygonal capitals without foliage, of the 'Tudor flower,' and other details usually attributed to Perpendicular architecture, may be seen in buildings of an earlier date than Wykeham's. The style which we call 'Perpendicular' was in part suggested by, in part a reaction from, the combination of vertical and horizontal lines in flowing tracery. The style lent itself to the increased use of figurepainting on glass, requiring a rectilineal and vertical framing, the extension of window spaces, the lowering of roofs, and consequent development of buttresses, flat keyed vaulting, and four-centred arches. Wykeham, however, was building on a great scale during the greater part of a period of sixty years, a period coinciding with that in which the principles of the Perpendicular style were laid down; and it is just to give him much of the credit, or as the enthusiasts of thirty years ago would say, the discredit, of the change.

In all that Wykeham did and wrote, as well as in his architectural and collegiate works, we may observe the same thoroughness and knowledge of details, the same legal knowledge and acuteness, the same adaptation of means to ends, both material and financial, which are symbolized by the oftenrepeated opus feliciter consummavit. For Wykeham, though a noble spender, was no waster of money. It is computed that he expended in building for the King, and on his own account, a sum equivalent to a million of modern money: but, whatever he lays out, care is always taken that there shall be no waste; that parties benefited by his work, e.g. the conventual body in possession of the Cathedral, shall take their fair share of the burden; that all payments shall be made regularly; and that, in the event of his own death, the work shall be carried on 'honeste et honorifice, conformiter et decenter, secundum exigentiam, formam et modum novi operis nunc incepti.' It is characteristic of him that he left nothing incomplete.

Both at New College and at Winchester nothing is too small to escape the Founder's attention. The position of all the buildings is carefully considered in the true spirit of an architect who considers use before beauty, adapting and improving the instances already before him. It would occupy

^{*} It is quite possible, however, that Wykeham was employed by Edingdon in these works, and perhaps also by Thos. Foxley at Bramshill. (Moberly, p. 23, note)

[†] See, on this subject, Mr. Moberly's work, chap. xii.

too much space to enter here into these interesting details; and as all that Wykeham built at Winchester is still standing, and in full usefulness, we have only to take the buildings themselves, with Mr. Kirby's account of the documents connected with them, to have a full text and comment of the whole

design.

We may note, however, as marking the character of his work, the disposition of the buildings of both Colleges. At New College, the Warden's lodgings, commanding a view of the whole structure; the bursaries near the hall and library; the library on the first floor; the scholars' chambers, with a study attached to each; the porter's lodge close to the gate, the chapel, and the cloister, of which he was the outdoor guardian; the bell-tower standing apart from the chapel, partly for dignity, partly to avoid all danger from the vibration of the bells; the chapel, hall, and muniment room, contrived so as to give 'the impression of one uniform and imposing mass';" the western transept extending to north and south beyond the main walls of the chapel, to beautiful and commodious an arrangement that it was adopted both at Eton by Waynflete, and in Oxford at Magdalen, All Souls', and Wadham; the offices abutting on the city walls, and apart from the more dignified buildings, to avoid all unsightliness and nuisance. These features are in the main repeated at Winchester, with differences demanded by the site: for instance, the offices-brewhouse, stables, malthouse, slaughter-house—are in the first court, with access to the brook which bounds the College on the east; and communicate by a backway with the kitchen, which stands to the west of the Hall and Chapel. The school was to the west of the Chapel, under the Hall.

Less care seems to have been taken for the convenience of the scholars at Winchester than at Oxford; they were lodged in large dormitories in the basement, not as at Eton on the first floor, which was occupied by the Fellows' chambers; nor were their bodily needs so carefully attended to. They were to serve as well as to learn; to wait upon themselves, to wash in 'Conduit' on the other side of the court, to lie upon straw, to rise at five, to sweep their chambers and clean their shoes, to fear the rod, and to endure hardness of all kinds. It was not the Founder's object to rear up candidates for an idle and luxurious priesthood; he wished to train his scholars to be self-reliant, to obey and command, to be serious, diligent,

^{*} Cockerell, in 'Journal of Archæological Institute,' 1845.

[†] At New College, not at Winchester.

and devout; and in so doing he did a good work for his own age, and established a type of Christian boyhood to which, as the history of the school shows, his children have not been unfaithful.

s;

d-

n-

ole

k,

W.

he

he

dy

he

n;

or

he

to di.

he

an

e,

es

ed

se

es

e,

th

id

to

st.

1e

in

st

re

re-

n

v,

S

18

le

to-

t,

d

21111

The character of thoroughness and moderation which Wykeham displayed as builder and founder is observable in what we can gather of his public life as a Chancellor and a Prelate. is difficult, if not impossible, to separate personal from official action in the case of an ecclesiastic and statesman of the Middle Wykeham was seldom out of office from the time that he became Keeper of the Privy Seal in 1364, and Secretary to Edward III. in 1366, till he retired from public life in 1391, and from attendance in Parliament in 1399. He was twice Chancellor, in 1367 and in 1389, and was employed in affairs of State and in constant attendance on the Court during the last twenty years of the reign of Edward III., and during part of that of Richard II. It was a time during which the Commons of England were asserting their power, and claiming much which had been held in earlier times to belong to the royal prerogative, or the rights of the magnates of the realm. The last twenty years of Edward III.'s life were clouded by the failure of his great schemes in France, by the social and political changes ensuing on the Black Death in 1349, and the plague of 1361; by the insolence of favourites and mistresses; by the ambition of John of Gaunt; by the ecclesiastical and religious questions connected with the Papal schism; the conflicting claims of the Papal Curia and the Church of England; the rise of Lollardy; by the quarrels in the Royal Family, the illness and death of the Black Prince, the feuds and baronial pretensions of the great landowners, the rise and fall of the De la Poles and Veres: all of which causes combined to make the half-century of Wykeham's episcopate one of the most troublous and stormy times in the history of England; preluding as it did to the anarchy of the reign of Henry VI. and the despotism of the York and Tudor sovereigns.

. It is no small credit to one who took so prominent a part in public affairs that Wykeham was respected by all parties, that his fall from power was caused by a discreditable cabal, that he was fully cleared and reinstated, that he was employed by Richard II. during the only virtuous part of his reign; and that when he retired from Richard's service, and some years later acquiesced in his deposition, he had no part in his punishment; and yet was regarded with favour by Henry IV. Nor did John of Gaunt, with whom Wykeham tried and got a fall, bear a lasting grudge against him. Few of the public men of his time escaped the the vengeance of one party or another. Wykeham did not make enemies, yet he was no trimmer or shifter. He supported the Black Prince in the championship of the Commons in the Good Parliament of 1376, and after the death of his friend and patron was not afraid to incur the enmity of his too powerful brother by upholding the measures of that memorable Parliament. He had for a time to bow to the storm, to lose favour, power, and money, and to retire to the seclusion of Waverley Abbey, while the revenues of his See were given to the young Prince of Wales; to see the Duke of Lancaster in office, Alice Perrers restored to her place at Court, Wyclif supported, French troops ravaging the Isle of Wight, the old King unable to shake off the bad influences which surrounded him, or to assert his own will; Lancaster's friends pardoned and received into favour, and his opponents driven from Court; and himself specially and singly excepted from pardon when a reconciliation of parties took place.

If Wykeham had never been disgraced, he might be set down as a clever time-server, an instance of that type of man whose soul is entirely in business, and who is more desirous of employment than careful of consistency. But his fall from power not only clears him from this imputation, but shows us incidentally what his position before the Court was.

Without going closely into the circumstances of the case, we can see that Wykeham's cause was bound up with that of Peter de la Mare, the Speaker of the Good Parliament, and the most prominent member of the popular or constitutional party in the Commons. The clergy had their own rights to defend, and did not identify themselves with this party. But they warmly supported Wykeham. He was not summoned to the Parliament of 1377. But he received his writ for Convocation, and was defended by that body; and though John of Lancaster sought to gain popularity by supporting Wyclif, who was summoned just at this moment to answer before Archbishop Sudbury to articles of heresy (in which affair Wykeham appeared as an orthodox Churchman), the result showed which was the popular cause. On the one hand, we have Lancaster seeking to gain power by opposing the clergy, whose corruption in life and doctrine was the theme of Wyclif's complaints; on the other, Courtenay and Wykeham, de la Mare and his party in the late Parliament, whose main object was to secure economical government, whether in the hands of the clergy or not-an end only to be attained by parliamentary control of expenditure.

In the riot which arose on this occasion John of Gaunt's power was shaken. London rose against him; and his house,

and perhaps his life, was saved by his opponent, Bishop Courtenay. The Duke had made a false move, 'seeking a knot in a rush,' when he attacked Wykeham. The Bishop's temporalities were restored to him just before the death of Edward III., an event which changed the fortunes of parties, and put an end to Lancaster's predominance. The young King Richard was in the hands of his father's friends; John of Gaunt retired from Court; Alice Perrers had fled already, de la Mare was set at liberty, and the men of the Good Parliament returned to power. Wykeham was present at Richard's coronation, and received not only his pardon, 'learnedly and largely penned,' but with it an explicit statement that he was 'wholly innocent and guiltless' of all the

charges brought against him.

ot

IP-

ns

nis

00

ole

se

of

en

ter

lif

old

ed

ed

m

on

set

of

re

nis

ut

we

er

he

id

p-

nt

as

to

ist

es

XC

se,

oy

as

ıt,

ıt,

e 's

ıd

As a Churchman, Wykeham was a strong upholder of the rights of the Church of England against the Papal power. The great Statute of Provisors of 1390, re-enacting the Statutes of 1351 and 1362 with additional safeguards against Roman usurpation, and the Statute of Mortmain of 1391, were passed in his Chancellorship: and that of Præmunire, one of the strongest defensive measures taken during the Middle Ages against Rome, ‡ completing and extending the Act of 1353, though passed after Wykeham had given up the Great Seal, was enacted whilst Richard II. was still in the hands of the constitutional party, and had not begun to establish a tyranny. We may be sure that Wykeham furthered both of these great national acts. Mr. Moberly has shown § that he was even as a young man looked upon with disfavour at Rome as a supporter of the national party. He had been attacked as a pluralist (not without reason) by the Curia. He owed his appointment as Bishop of Winchester to the King's conqé d'élire and the election of the conventual chapter, not to Papal Provision, though Urban V., after a delay of nine months, issued the Bull of Provision; and he deserves the reputation of being one of those statesmen who upheld the national character of the Church of England, though he had no sympathy with the opinions of Wyclif; whom, by the way, he must have known in his Windsor days, when Wyclif was one of Edward III.'s chaplains.

As Bishop of Winchester he was distinguished by zeal for the rights of his office and constant attention to his duty. He restored or rebuilt all the manor-houses and palaces belong-

^{*} Coke, 'Instit.' p. 149, quoted by Bp. Lowth.

ing to the See. He was diligent in making visitations, a corrector of discipline both at St. Cross and Winchester, one who did not fear to assert and enforce his authority, as he showed in dealing with the executors of his predecessor Bishop Edingdon, with the refractory Prior of St. Cross, and the Prior and brethren of St. Swithun's. His diocesan Register, preserved in the Cathedral, shows him to have been an 'indefatigable worker'* and a sound man of business in all the secular affairs connected with his office. There is no better instance of the great medieval Prelate; a type which we do not wish to revive, but to which England owes much of its stability and progress amidst the baronial feuds and royal encroachments of the

Middle Ages.

Wykeham retired from public life in 1391 at the age of sixtyseven. Three years later, having finished his colleges, he resumed the grand design of rebuilding the nave of the Cathedral. The work, begun twenty years before, had been interrupted by many causes: the expenses incurred in building and endowing his foundations; the great loss of money involved in his disgrace; disputes with the monks of St. Swithun, occasioned by the bad discipline of the convent, of which he was ex-officio Abbot, refractory Priors, a question of right of way through the Cathedral, and his own ceaseless occupation in the affairs of his diocese and of the State, had combined to prevent him from completing this his last great work. But in 1394 he was able to begin again, and the work was not remitted till his death ten years later. Public affairs, moreover, were going from bad to worse. The King had taken the bit between his teeth, and preferred the counsel of the young men to that of his grandfather's advisers. Wykeham, if he had meddled in politics, would have done no good, and probably would have lost his head. His health too was failing: and this, combined with his advancing years, we may suppose, was his principal reason for retiring from Court. It was not till 1397 that Richard II, began his career of violence, in which, if he had shown character as well as ability, he might have succeeded. The princes of the blood, including Lancaster and his son, Henry of Derby, were friendly, Gloucester alone implacable. The King impeached and beheaded the Earl of Arundel; banished his brother Archbishop Arundel, Warwick, and Mortimer; murdered the Duke of Gloucester at Calais, and tried to make a new party for himself. He succeeded, indeed, in making the Parliament of Shrewsbury (1398) vote him a revenue for life, and delegate its whole power to a

^{*} Stubbs, vol. ii. p. 413.

10

n

ı,

n

le

1-

ıt

ıt is

e

7-

d

e

S

d

t,

e

g

d

e

s

s

committee of those whom he believed to be his friends. 'Then the King began to reign more fiercely than before,' and by forced loans and outlawing of counties turned all his subjects against him. He soon made an enemy of Derby, whom he had lately (1397) advanced to the dukedom of Hereford, by refusing him the succession to the honours of his father, 'time-honoured Lancaster,' who died in February 1399. He raised a standing army, appearing at the famous lists of Coventry with ten thousand archers to overawe both Hereford and Mowbray. Henry of Lancaster became the popular hero. The King, in an evil hour for himself, took his army over to Ireland, and on his return, by one of those sudden changes of fortune so common in the next century, found his kingdom taken from him and himself a prisoner.

We have no certain knowledge of Wykeham's action during this period. But at the moment of Richard's expedition to Ireland he appointed a suffragan to administer his diocese for six months,* being 'so occupied with the affairs of the King and the kingdom, as to be unable to bestow time on the pastoral care of his diocese.' He had delayed obedience to the King's command to all his lieges to swear to abide by the decision of the Parliament of Shrewsbury, which had by form of law made Richard an absolute monarch; but something which is unexplained, probably a sense of personal danger as being a conspicuous supporter of popular rights, made him issue an order in May 1399 to his clergy to take the required oath. This was temporising, no doubt; but the King's wrath is as the roaring of a lion. He remained at one or other of his houses near London during the summer of 1399; and we may fairly surmise from the sequel that he was not unconcerned in the revolution of that year. What justified Bishop Compton in appealing to William of Orange in 1688, the supreme interest of the nation, may be held to have justified Wykeham in throwing in his lot with Archbishop Arundel and supporting Henry of Lancaster. He was a cautious man, and not likely to declare himself too soon; but there is no reason to suppose that he was dishonest.

He appeared in Parliament when Richard's deposition was declared; but, though he was at Southwark at the time, he had nothing to do with the secret and perpetual imprisonment to which the unfortunate King was sentenced. It is, perhaps, worthy of record that the last suffragan he appointed (Jan. 1404) was Thomas Merks, the former Bishop of Carlisle, who alone had

had the courage to speak in favour of the dethroned Richard,*

and had in consequence been deprived.

In the same year he finished building the chantry in which his body now rests, and on the 27th of September, 1404, he died at his house at Bishop's Waltham, and was buried in his Cathedral Church, as he had desired.

We now return to the work by which his name is known above that of the great Churchmen and builders, the foundation

of his Colleges.

In founding a school and college for the training of priests, not a monastery, Wykeham did but follow the fashion of his day, and of the generation which preceded him: but he alleges as his motive for departing from Bishop Edingdon's precedent the notorious corruption of the monastic orders. As early as 1368 Wykeham was maintaining scholars both at Oxford and at Winchester, the place of his own education and early training, to which he had returned as Bishop in 1367. In 1373 'Richard Herton, Gramaticus,' was engaged to teach these 'poor scholars' for the space of ten years. It was to carry on this work that he built his College at Winchester; and New College at Oxford was designed to complete and crown his Winchester institution. Walter de Merton, says Mr. Adams, 'may claim the credit of the collegiate system at the University, which he initiated. Wykeham supplemented his design by adding to it the previous preparation of the public school.'

New College was begun in 1379 and finished in 1386; Winchester College was begun in 1387 and finished in 1393. The great builder did not let the grass grow under his feet. The work cost about a thousand pounds, perhaps equivalent to 15,000l. of our money, besides the value (a considerable sum) of such materials as came from the lands of the bishopric. It was on the 28th of March, 1393, that the Warden and Society made their solemn entry into the College, twenty years after the first institution of Wykeham's school at Winchester; and the Quin-

gentenary is dated from this event.

The Statutes both of New College and St. Mary Winton were drawn by the Founder himself, and did not leave his hands till they had been perfected by additions and alterations suggested by the actual working of the institutions themselves.

The Society (as it is still called) is to consist of a Warden (Custos), ten Fellows, seventy scholars (pauperum et indigencium scolarium gramaticali sciencie intendere debencium),† priests, chaplains, clerks, and choristers, a Headmaster (magistri

^{*} Shakspeare, 'Richard II.' act iv. sc. 1. † Statutes, rubric i. Kirby, p. 456. informatoris

informatoris in gramatica), and a second or lower Master

(hostiarii).

ch

ed

al

vn

on

ts,

is

es

nt

as ad

g,

rd s

he

rd

n.

of

d.

us

n-

he

he

DI.

ch

on de

rst

n-

on

is

ns s.

en m

ts,

tri

56.

ris

The Warden is to be elected by the Fellows of New College. He is to have a stipend, servants, and allowances, including a portion of cloth served out by the Bursars annually to all members and servants of the Foundation. The Warden is to consult the Fellows, and be ruled by their vote in all matters of importance. Practically at Winchester, as at Eton, the Warden had a veto on all proceedings, and the opportunity, if he liked to use it, of interfering with the Headmaster in his government of the school; for it is one thing to appoint a Headmaster to rule the school, and another to leave him alone.

The Founder's kin are to have preference at elections; and, if place is not found for any of them at New College, may remain at Winchester till the age of twenty-five. The Founder's kin proved to be a considerable burden to the College, as they multiplied geometrically in the course of generations, and the number had to be limited. Nevertheless, we are conservative enough to regret the entire abolition of an institution which kept alive the sense of personal attachment to the memory of the Founder, and impressed upon the College a character which he desired that it should retain. The privilege of Founder's kin was highly prized by those who enjoyed it; it was not greatly abused; and ties of natural sentiment, though they must yield to utility, ought not to be lightly broken.

The bulk of the Statutes, which are enormously long, is taken up with numerous regulations for the daily life of the Society; regulations which were certain to become obsolete, in great measure, in the course of years. We question here the foresight of the Founder, who established what was, it may be, a perfect constitution for his own time, but by tying up his successors too tightly, tempted them to disregard the spirit, and in some cases the letter, of his commands. Thus we find that the qualification for scholars 'in plano cantu competenter instructi' was considered in later years to be satisfied by the repetition of the verse 'All people that on earth do dwell.' This was a trifle; but the practice of nomination to scholarships by rotation among the Fellows was a more serious departure from the intention of the Founder. Again, the Fellows were to be resident, and therefore to hold no benefices; priests, and therefore to remain unmarried. The Founder, it would seem, would have been well advised if he had left somewhere a power of revision; but in not doing this, he only acted as others of his time did in like circumstances, and as the Public Schools' Commissioners acted in 1871.

The system of government by means of prefects, monitors or præpostors, and its complement fagging—a system valued by the fathers and dreaded by the mothers of English boys—if not invented, was at any rate organized by Wykeham. It was in accordance with the customs of the time. The pages in a lord's retinue were expected to do menial offices, and no doubt the same practice was used in conventual and cathedral schools: a survival of it is the serving of choristers in Hall at Winchester, and at the Universities; and till a few years ago, three lower boys stood every day at the head of the Sixth Form table in the Hall of Eton College as 'servitors,' to wait on the Sixth Form.

'In each of the lower Chambers' (we quote from the Founder's Statutes) 'there shall be at least three scholars of good character (honesti), more advanced than the others in ripeness (maturitate), discretion, and knowledge, who shall superintend their chamber-fellows (consociis concameralibus) in their studies, and have a diligent care of them (diligenter supervideant), and from time to time . . . truly certify the Warden, Vice-Warden, and Headmaster of their character, conversation, and progress in study.'

Here, says Mr. Adams, we see the creation of the eighteen College Prefects, there being six Chambers and three Prefects in each. For further details, such as the duties and privileges of Prefect of Hall (the great potentate of all), Bible Clerk, Ostiarius, Prefects of Tub and Cloisters (now obsolete), and Chapel, we refer the curious to Mr. Adams's fascinating pages, or to any Wykehamist; for in five hundred years little has been changed, the same names attaching to the same offices, and even the same words being used by the Warden or Headmaster in appointing to each—praeficio te aulae, &c.

Waynflete transferred this system to Eton, where, though the name 'Prefect' does not now exist, the institution was copied even to the number of boys put in authority: an institution which has spread from Winchester into all our public schools, and in various forms and degrees exists and works in all.

Dr. Arnold, who is looked upon as the reviver or second founder of the Public Schools system, adopted this principle fully. 'Moral childishness,' 'the great curse of public schools,' tould, in his opinion, be combated by no other means so well as by the maintenance of 'a regular government among the boys themselves.' He took as a starting-point 'the institution as he

^{* &#}x27;Wykehamica,' p. 56. ' † Stanley's 'Life of Dr. Arnold,' vol. i. p. 112.

found it and as he remembered it at Winchester.' It was the 'keystone of his whole government'; and he regarded it 'not only as an efficient engine of discipline, but as the chief means of creating a respect for moral and intellectual excellence,' in the school.*

We know that Arnold's good young men had their faults, and were sometimes looked upon as prigs; but Arnold was right in his belief that ordered responsibility is part of a wise training, and that, whatever its dangers may be, they are less than those which attend the government of the weak by the strong, which is the alternative.

In one hundred and fifty years at least, the arrangements ordained by the Founder were maintained without any other innovation than the introduction (in 1454) of the vimen quadrifidum, or rod of four apple twigs,—for in this, as in other things, Winchester must have her peculiar institution; and the addition of Greek to the subjects taught in school. We have no very ancient account of the daily life of a Winchester boy: the earliest extant dates from the sixteenth century, like Malim's Consuctudinarium at Eton. The boys rose very early. It was not till the time of Queen Anne that Bishop Trelawney asked that the scholars might lie in bed in the winter till six, and might be relieved from the charge of making their own beds. 'Surgite!' shouts (as in Hall at Eton) the Prefect; Latin Psalms are sung, the Chambers are put in order, the boys wash at 'Moab,' and go into chapel at half-past five, and school at six; three hours of it, with no breakfast and no fire. How could any boys, even medieval boys, have survived it? Not till nine did they get the bread and beer which was their first meal. School began again at eleven, and dinner was at twelve, taken in messes of four. Afternoon school, a drowsy time, lasted, with an interval for 'bever,' from two till five. At that hour the whole Society, headed by the Warden, went circum, i.e. made the round of the College buildings, saying prayers and singing hymns; then came supper in Hall, and Chambers till eight, then Evensong, and so to bed. On Tuesdays and Thursdays, if the weather was fine, the whole school went to 'Hills,' a custom which continued till late years; and for which, as it continued so long, there was probably some justification: but to a non-Wykehamist it would appear a strange employment of play hours to walk in procession two and two to St. Catherine's Hill, a mile distant, and return the same way two hours later, the intervening time having been spent by

,

^{*} Stanley's 'Life of Dr. Arnold,' chap. iii.

many of the boys neither 'in books nor work, nor healthful play,' but in waiting about till the word 'Domum' from the three juniors in College, and 'on' from the Prefect of Hall,

gave them leave to return to College.

The name of a holiday at Winchester was, and is, a 'remedy,' * the origin of which word, as of many 'notions,' is uncertain; but it is commonly explained as remissionis dies. In former times the remedy used to be granted by the giving and receiving a ring, the posy on which was anciently potentiam gero feroque, and in later times commendat rarior usus; a hint to the Prefect not to ask too often.

The Warden's 'child,' a College Junior appointed to be the Warden's representative, asked the Headmaster, in the name of Prefect of Hall,† to grant a 'remedy.' If granted, the Headmaster took the 'remedy ring' off his finger, and it was worn during the day by the Prefect of School, who returned it to the Headmaster the following morning. Once, it is recorded, the ring was lost, but found in the Itchen. The ring and the

custom exist to this day; and long may they survive.

These ceremonies continued with little alteration till the time when the Public Schools' Commissioners did away with much that was venerable and more that was useless. The abolition of the building inhabited by the Commoners, the second estate in the school, and called by their name, and the distribution of the Commoners into Houses, the revision of hours and subjects of study, and the general humanising of the boys' habits, caused the discontinuance of much that was peculiar

to the place.

Rigid uniformity is best preserved by extreme strictness. The tradition which made a junior's life a succession of toils and hardships was enacted by each generation of boys as they passed from obedience to rule. It seemed to them that what had made them what they were must be good for the rising generation, and no humanitarian scruples made them spare the ground ash, or the stick drawn out of the faggot, which was the instrument of discipline. There was much roughness and some cruelty. As Cowper wrote in his terrible indictment of the public schools of his time:-

> 'The rude will scuffle through with ease enough-Great schools best suit the sturdy and the rough.' I

The Prefects, moreover, sometimes forgot or misconstrued

^{*} Also spelt 'remi-day.'
† Not 'the Prefect of Hall.' The definite article is unknown at Winchester. t 'Tirocinium,' l. 340.

their responsibility, and would allow or encourage the misconduct of their juniors. But instances of this were rare, though the standard of humanity was low, as Anthony Trollope and his brother have borne witness in their Memoirs. Other schools. as well as Winchester, have stories to tell of cruelties which hardened some, but broke the spirit of others. On the whole, the institution of government by the elder boys worked well, and justified the Founder's wisdom.

9

e

r

One of the most peculiar features of the Prefectorial system at Winchester, the superintendence of the studies as well as the behaviour of the juniors by the Prefects, is clearly ordained by the Founder, and continued till recent times, under the name of Boy Tutors.' Every junior had to submit his work to a Prefect, who received a small money payment for his labours, and was held responsible to the Master in school for his pupil's This practice exists no longer; but it was abandoned with regret, and was vigorously defended before the Public Schools' Commissioners by Dr. Moberly, the then Headmaster.

Ancient traditions still survive in College. If a curious stranger looks into one of the chambers in which the boys sleep, a hospitable Prefect makes him sit down near the fire, and burns in his honour a new half-faggot with a candle or 'functior' introduced into it to enliven the blaze. Here, too, the authority of Prefects is more absolute, and the knowledge of 'notions' is more strictly required of the juniors than in 'Houses,' and the rules of games are more carefully observed. The presence of a large number of Prefects living in one building ensures greater esprit de corps, and combined with this is a certain degree of roughness, not altogether to be condemned in a luxurious age.

Altogether there prevails at Winchester a simplicity of life which compares favourably with the extravagance and selfindulgence too common in more fashionable schools. We have no wish to return to 'tunding,' 'tin gloves,' toefittie,' schemes,' blanket tossing,'† and the stupid harshness of the old régime. Boys are kinder to each other at Winchester and elsewhere than they were in the days of our ancestors, and this is a clear gain. But there is perhaps a danger of losing some of the old manliness and endurance, the self-reliance and readiness which hardened our forefathers, 'the wrestling thews that throw the world'; and the emollition of manners, which is so noticeable in the boys of to-day, may be bought too dear.

^{* &#}x27;Tunding' survives, and was the occasion of a newspaper scandal some years to But it is carefully guarded from abuse by modern regulations.

† See Mr. Adams's Glossary of 'Notions.'

We return to the history of the school. One of the notable facts in its earlier history is the migration in 1441 of Waynflete, the Headmaster, with a number of scholars, to set going the new school founded at Eton by Henry VI. Waynflete was soon afterwards made Provost of Eton, and later, as Bishop of Winchester, founded Magdalen College at Oxford; in the arms of which, in honour of his connexion with Eton, he introduced a chief charged with three lilies. In his memory, a figure in a niche has been set up this year on the west front of the chapel at Eton, the fabric of which he completed at his own charges, Another instance of the good feeling between Winchester and Eton was the 'Amicabilis Concordia,' a document drawn up in 1464 and sworn to by the four Colleges of Wykeham and King Henry, by which they bound themselves to mutual support and friendship. The original documents, one of which no doubt was deposited in each muniment room, cannot be found; but the sentiment still survives; and it was noticed that at the dinner in the great hall of the Castle, which took place on the 25th of July in this year, no portion of the speeches delivered was more heartily applauded than those in which Eton was mentioned. At the old matches played at Lord's, Eton always wished Winchester, and Winchester Eton, to win their match against Harrow; and though it has happened once or twice in recent years that incidents of the game have thrown a cloud over the friendship of the two schools for the moment, it has always disappeared by the next summer. Such a feeling is creditable to both, and enlarges and elevates the patriotism of each. Such things may be looked upon as schoolboy trifles. But neither the virtues nor the sorrows of boyhood are trifles. They make the man; and though they may be forgotten, they are part of his nature, and bear fruit in his maturer years. it were not so, we should say with Cowper that

'Public schools 'tis public folly feeds.'

A father does not send his boy to the same school where he was educated merely from a cat-like fondness for locality, nor because he wishes him to be tarred with the same brush as himself. He wishes him to bear the yoke as he bore it, but to be happy too; and in spite of all faults, boys' lives must have been wholesome and happy at Winchester, or so large a number of Wykehamists would not come from Wykehamist families.

The origin of Commoners, which we have called the second estate at Winchester, is obscure. Here, as at Eton, the Statutes provided for the instruction in this school of a small number of sons nobilium et valencium personarum; they are not to exceed

le

e,

he

as

of

ns

ed

el

es.

 $\mathbf{n}\mathbf{d}$

in

ng

nd

bt

ut

he

he

ed

as

YS

ch

in ud

as

is

of

es.

es.

ey If

as

or

as

to

ve

er

nd es of

ed

en

ten in number, and are to impose no burden upon the College. They are called extranei, and later commensales, whence, or rather from the term comunae, 'commons,' arises the name 'Commoner.' There were two classes of these, answering to gentlemencommoners or fellow-commoners, and commoners or pensioners at the two Universities. The former dined at the High Table, commensales cum sociis; the latter with the scholars. Some boys appear to have lodged in the town, as commensales extra Collegium. To these various classes of boarders were added day boys also. Day boys disappeared; but the number of commoners continually increased, till it became desirable to bring them together and within College precincts.

This was done by Dr. Burton, Headmaster 1724-66, 'who did so much for Commoners as to entitle him to the fame of their second Founder.'* He established a boarding-house for Commoners in College, and some years afterwards got possession of premises contiguous to the College stables on the west, and abutting on the street. This site originally belonged to a convent of Sisters of Mercy dependent on the Cathedral monks, the Priory of St. Swithun, and ran up to the western boundary of the College. Two ancient buildings standing on this site, the Cistern (or Sustern) House and the Cistern Chapel, originally the dwelling-house and the chapel of the Sisters, but so changed as to show few traces of their ancient use, were turned by Dr. Burton into a dwelling-house for himself, and chambers, studies, and a dining-hall for Commoners. The space enclosed by the Cistern Chapel, also called 'Wickham's,' on the north, the back of the College stables on the east, the Cistern house (or Spital) on the south, and 'Cloister Gallery' built by Dr. Burton on the west, was termed Commoners' Court, and the whole concern was known as 'Commoners.' †

Old Commoners lasted for about a century,—'a strange, rambling, bizarre old place,' says Mr. Adams, 'possessing no atom of architectural beauty or grace, and uncomfortable to an extent of which not even boys could be unaware. Its removal was not only an excusable, but an inevitable measure.'

One of Dr. Moberly's principal objects on becoming Headmaster in 1836 was to rebuild Commoners. New Commoners, which has now been converted into a handsome building, including the Moberly Library and the new schoolrooms, occupied the greater part of the site of Old Commoners. The work was well done; too well, indeed, as Mr. Adams

^{*} Kirby, p. 132.

[†] Ibid., pp. 133, 134. See also Adams's 'Wykehamica,' chap. xii.
Vol. 177.—No. 354. 2 C complains,

complains, for the foundations were too solid to admit of the free passage of water under them, and the well-constructed walls and windows did but supply that irregular ventilation through crazy partitions, half-rotten tiles, and ill-fitting windows which let in air enough to turn a mill.' The result was a frequent recurrence of illness. Moreover, the new building was less suited to furnish proper supervision by Prefects, whose authority was always less complete in Commoners than in College. The boys were less healthy and less happy than in their miserable quarters in Old Commoners, and it was a great day for the School' when Mr. Wickham opened the first boarding-house in 1860. In 1868 'Commoners' ceased to exist, and the boys boarding there were removed by Dr. Ridding to four houses built in Culver's Close. Five more have been added since then; the bulk of the school thus taking the prevailing form in other public schools, and College only remaining to carry on the ancient comobitic arrangement.

The architectural conversion of 'Commoners' into 'Moberly' is so complete, that it is difficult to recognize in the handsome Gothic structure, with dressings of carved stone, the old forbidding three-sided red building, with its triple rows of sash windows,

once known as 'Commoners.'

The change from Commoners to houses was a change wholly for the better, one of those which make an epoch in the life of an institution, and show its vitality by the vigour with which it can adapt itself to new circumstances. Those who remember Commoners, whether New or Old, speak of it with that kind of affectionate disgust which betrays to the impartial stranger how detestable its arrangements must have been, whether as regards health and cleanliness, work or play. The brutality which discomfort fosters was not absent from Commoners. Manners were even rougher there than in College; the boys lived in a crowd; there was little supervision of seniors or juniors, no privacy, not much decency in the arrangements of the place, if we take the account given by Mr. Adams, no hostile witness. No one was ever blamed; it was 'the system'; nor does the question ever seem to have been asked, How did the system come into existence, and why was it allowed to continue? Winchester is not the only place where such questions have been asked, and the answer is as old as the story of Eli and his sons.

The Computus Rolls, many extracts from which are given by Mr. Kirby, are full of picturesque details, throwing light on the common life of the Middle Ages. The Society appear from the first to have kept up a bountiful hospitality; and d

n

w

-

rs

y

it

d

be

т.

re

ng

ly

y ?

ne

ng

s,

lly

of

ch

er

nd

ger

as

ity

TS.

ys

or

nts

ns,

he

ed.

it

ere

the

ven

ght

ear

and

no

no doubt the Founder intended his College to rank among the great houses of the land, whose munificence consisted in great measure in keeping open house. They received all the great personages who visited Winchester, royal and ecclesiastical; and among them the young king Henry VI., who was entertained by them no less than ten times during the period when he was studying the institutions of Winchester in view of his own foundations. He gave royal presents in return for this hospitality: his second best robe furred with sables, 'furratam cum furrura de sables;' a gold cup and ten pounds of gold to be made into cruets; a tabernacle of gold and two bowls of silver gilt with the arms of France and England,—all gone long ago into the melting-pot.

We may notice among others that William Waynflete was feasted with great splendour in Hall, and a 'jantaclum,' or breakfast, was given to the Provosts of Eton and King's who came to his installation in the Cathedral. One 'jantaclum' was given to Waynflete and the Warden of New College, to get their good offices with the King 'pro amplioribus possessionibus ad valorem c. marcarum'; another to the grand jury 'pro favoribus suis habendis' in behalf of Robert Colmer, the tenant of Hamble. Let us hope that Robert was not 'an arrant knave,' like William Visor of Wincot; but 'an honest man, Sir, is able to speak for himself, when a knave is not.'

The Society took some of their rents in kind, such as oysters, bread, ale, gowns, shoes. They received presents: copes and other vestments, images, church plate and jewels, from princes and cardinals; and from humbler friends, books, game, 'a chine of pork and a collar of brawn.' They gave presents also: a flagon of red wine and a pottle of bastard to the Judges on circuit; eels and lampreys to an invalid; warden pears domino Episcopo, Cardinal Beaufort—to the same a collation of trout, cherries, and wine, and on another occasion capons for a birthday present, a pair of horses, twelve bows and six dozen arrows fledged with peacock and other feathers, for his use when hunting in his parks and manors; six ells of black kerseymere to the Provost of Eton, and 6s. 8d. distributed among the Eton boys. It would not go far nowadays; and the boys seem to have thought so, for at the next visit to Eton the present amounted to 13s. 4d.

We have a glimpse of the difficulties of travelling, when we read how bows and arrows have to be bought to protect the Warden going on progress, 'quia periculum erat de latronibus in via'; and in 1457 'gonnes' and 'gonne powder' were got for a like purpose.

At home, their beds and chambers are hung with red and green buckram, or red and yellow, with fringes of silk and crewel, pointed fustian, red and green serge—what would Mr. William Morris give for a sight of them! The Chapel has vestments of red tissue made from King Henry's robe, of blue velvet, of red velvet with orphreys of cloth of gold, of green bawdekyn, worked with the Three Kings, with the Salutation, the Crucifixion, with golden roses, with pheasants and swans with two necks, and so on. It is rich also in vessels of silver and silver gilt, images and jewels, including fifteen chalices and patens, two of them of gold; the whole amounting to 3892 oz. of silver and 91 oz. of gold, which may be roughly computed at the value of 1000l. at that date (1525), or from 12,000l. to 15,000l. in modern money. Most of this was swept into the King's Treasury and the pockets of his friends.

Our notice of Winchester would be incomplete without some account of the Wardens and Headmasters who have left their mark on the school. The first of these is Warden Morys (1393-1413), who deserves mention as having been chosen by the Founder himself to preside over the work of his College, and as having been remembered by him ten years later in his will. It was in his time (1399) that the new king, Henry IV., paid a visit to the College. Wykeham, as we have seen, had sanctioned by his presence, but not taken a prominent part in the deposition of Richard II. and the succession

of Henry IV.

The second Warden, Robert Thurbern (1413-1450), was a wise but liberal steward of the possessions of the Society. He completed out of the funds bequeathed by John Fromond, steward of the College Manors, the beautiful chantry which bears Fromond's name, and now serves as a chapel for Juniors. Thurbern is known best by his own chantry in the Chapel, which was built, after his death, out of the proceeds of lands given by him, on the site of Wykeham's wooden belfry. The chantry and the tower which surmounted it had to be taken down in 1863, and were conscientiously rebuilt, as they now stand at the south-west angle of the Chapel, as a memorial to the 'two Wardens,' Williams and Barter.

It was in Thurbern's time that Waynflete was transferred to Eton. No other Headmaster of Winchester ever went to Eton; but several instances of the converse change took place. Winchester was established in popular favour, Eton was but a

sapling. 'Parva sub ingenti matris se subicit umbra.'

Both Colleges were hard put to it to steer a straight course when the Wars of the Roses broke out. Eton was within an

nd

be

ld

el

of

of

a-

nd

els

en

20

be

or

as

ne

ir

VS

by

e,

iis

7.,

n,

ni-

on

se

n-

of

l's

is

as

by

ry

in

at vo

to

to

e.

a

an

ce

ace of losing all its revenues to the neighbouring Chapel of St. George at Windsor. The Warden and Fellows of Winchester seem to have done their best, as no doubt did many quiet persons and societies, to keep out of the fray. They gave 'divers refections' to Queen Margaret's Chancellor, Thomas Uvedale, after her defeat at the battle of Tewkesbury in 1471; but in 1473 the Warden did homage to Edward IV., and obtained the renewal of the Charter of Privileges—not without payment of fees. This king had already visited Winchester in 1469, and on one occasion 'sent a lion to the College for the boys to see'; for which favour the College paid no less than twenty shillings.

Winchester College went through the changes which shook all England in the Tudor reigns without more loss than its neighbours. The Parliament of 1545 granted to the king all chantries, chapels, hospitals, and colleges (37 Henry VIII. c. 4), and an Act was passed in 1547 to suppress all such institutions (1 Edw. VI. c. 14). But neither of these took effect to the prejudice of Winchester or Eton, The College was, no doubt, purged of superstitious books and ceremonies, as it was purged of its plate; but no difficulties in the way of reformation are recorded. Elizabeth visited the College in 1570, and condescended to accept some of its lands for herself and her courtiers. More might have gone the same way, but Burleigh stood the friend of the Society, and even accepted the office of steward of their manors, which office he held for thirty years, drawing five pounds per annum for doing so, and leaving the steward's fee as a perpetual perquisite of the Treasurership.

Laud made a metropolitical visitation in 1635; and a few years later a more formidable visitation took place by Sir W. Waller and his troops; when Nathaniel Fiennes, an old Wykehamist, billeted some eighty troopers in the Warden's Court, costing the Society 281. 16s.; and again in 1645, when the royalist Governor of the Castle, Lord Ogle, surrendered to Oliver Cromwell. The Cathedral was miserably defaced; but it is said that the Founder's Chantry was spared by the exertions of a Wykehamist officer named Cuffe. The same pious office is generally believed to have been performed for the College by Fiennes, who was of the Founder's kin. Mr. Kirby, however, thinks that the Parliament army were not likely to injure the College, and that Warden Harris 'had friends on both sides.' At any rate, he was continued unmolested in his office, though

^{* &#}x27;History and Antiquities of Winchester.' 2 vols. Winton, 1773. Vol. i. p. 44.

he was reported to have taken up or disused superstitious bowings in the Chapel, according as the wind blew to or from Rome, preached against Prynne, Bastwick, and Burton, read a prelatical and superstitious bidding prayer, defended organical music in the Quire, broken the Sabbath, and sent money, horsemen, and plate to the King.

Warden Burt, who had been appointed by 'the intruded Warden and Fellows of New College' just before the death of the Protector in 1658, lost no time in presenting an address to Charles II., and, as far as we hear, no Fellows were molested in

consequence of the Restoration.

The Restoration brings us to the more modern history of the school. Warden Nicholas, 1671-1711 (partly at his own charges), built 'School,' a good specimen of the style of the times. School is no longer held there, and the room is used only on speech days, and for concerts and lectures; but no building has a closer connexion with the history of Winchester and the memories of Wykehamists during the last two hundred years. Here stood the Headmaster's awful throne, with the seat of Prefect of School at its side, and the vimen quadrifidum displayed to terrify the wicked. Here is the tabula legum, and the emblematical pictures of mitre, sword, pen, and rod, with the famous inscription 'aut disce aut discede,' and the conclusion (omitted at St. Paul's School), 'manet sors tertia caedi.' Here stood the 'scobs,' or oak boxes, which contained all that a boy could call his own; and here, in a Babel of voices from teacher and taught, our rude forefathers were 'up to books,' and received what under a good master was a very efficient education within the narrow limits which custom prescribed.

The youth of to-day, provided with books from which the hard passages have been extracted, translations good and bad to be got cheap, and half-heartedly forbidden; with notes elucidating every possible difficulty, and lessons cut so short as to make fatigue impossible; and sitting in luxurious class-rooms in classes of thirty-five or so, have every advantage which was denied to their ancestors, except one, the necessity for independence. No boy could go through old Winchester without learning how to take care of himself, whether or not the price paid for this was excessive; and it is certain that Winchester scholarship stood as high in the eighteenth century as it does this year, when the list of honours gained at the University and elsewhere

exceeds all former results.

'School' witnessed a strange scene in 1793, when the boys rebelled under Dr. Joseph Warton's mild rule. Dr. Warton could

not have wanted courage, for he once rebuked Dr. Johnson; but it is acknowledged that his habitual good nature had made the boys disorderly, and on this occasion he did not face them.

Warden Huntingford seems to have behaved badly in this difficult affair. Both the beginning and the close of the rebellion were marked by a want of generosity (to say the least) on the part of the authorities, which the boys easily magnified into a breach of faith; and what might have been a passing storm ended in the expulsion or compulsory retirement of thirty-six boys. Fortyone scholars were admitted at Winchester College in that year;

and there was no election to New College.

n

d

of

n

ıf

n

d

0

r

d

2,

ì,

a

1-

el

p

n

t-

е.

V

The rebellion, while it lasted, was serious enough. The keys were taken from the Porter, and all the servants except the cook turned out of College. The Warden, the Second Master, and a Fellow were imprisoned for a night in the Warden's dining-room. 'The bakers' and butchers' shops were sacked for provisions, and bludgeons, swords, and guns provided;' the cobble stones in the court were carried up to the gateway tower, and the stones of the parapet loosened. The rebels assumed the red cap,-we must bear in mind the date,-shouted 'liberty and equality,' and declared that they would burn the College down sooner than surrender. On the third day of the barring-out the boys put their cause into the hands of the High Sheriff of the county, induced to do so by Dr. Warton, whose goodwill towards his pupils was recognized by all; and a full amnesty was granted by the Warden. The boys had won a victory; but they were not allowed to enjoy it. They managed, easily enough, to put themselves in the wrong; and in the wholesale expulsion with which the rebellion ended, it is difficult to acquit Dr. Huntingford of vindictiveness. Dr. Warton had little opportunity of showing vigour; for the first offence was given by the Warden, and the conduct of affairs was taken by him out of the Headmaster's hands.

We should be glad to think that Dr. Warton's resignation was voluntary; but it is probable that the mutinous condition of the school was visited upon him, and that his age -he was seventy-as well as his 'too much lenity,' made his retirement desirable. Warden Huntingford and Dr. Goddard, who was the next Headmaster, had both been Warton's pupils; and the Warden is said to have spoken slightingly of his scholarship. It should be said, in parting with Dr. Warton, that not only was he the most conspicuous man of letters who was ever Headmaster of Winchester, but that 'there never was a man in his situation more universally beloved than he.'

There was no rebellion under Dr. Goddard; no one would have

Warden Barter?

have ventured to throw a dictionary at Dr. Goddard's head—a thing which, it is said, once happened to Dr. Warton. He was a strong man, who won the respect of his pupils by combined strictness and good humour. It is greatly to his credit that by a magnificent bequest he carried out the Founder's design of a free education to the scholars.

Another rebellion took place (also in Warden Huntingford's time) in the Headmastership of Dr. Gabell, in 1818, which, whether accidentally or not,* coincided in date with outbreaks at Eton, Harrow, Shrewsbury, and Sandhurst; but Dr. Gabell had no difficulty in putting it down, and did not suffer in reputation.

Such incidents are inevitable in the history of a school whenever it happens that its rulers do not understand the maxim principiis obsta, or will not trust boys, proceeding on the principle of expecting them to do wrong; an expectation which, in their case, is generally verified. Failure in a Headmaster is more conspicuous and more heavily visited than failure in almost any other profession except the army and navy. The punishment may be, and often is, disproportioned to the fault; for public opinion takes no account of the circumstances. So it was in this case. Gabell dealt with the rebellion promptly and successfully. Warton failed, and resigned.

It was of Dr. Gabell's pupils that John Keble said to his lecture room, 'I can allow none but Wykehamists to read off a passage into English'; so great was his reputation for accurate scholarship and the faculty of imparting it.

Wykehamists still living respect and cherish the memory of Dr. Williams, Gabell's successor. But the most prominent figure in the memory of the older generation is Warden Barter (1832–1861), whose noble presence, genial conversation, and warmth of character endeared him to all Wykehamists. 'His kindness of heart,' says Mr. Adams, 'and ready sympathy with the wants of others in their private affairs, exceeded that of any man I ever knew.' But who does not know the fame of

Dr. Barter died in February 1861, within a few months of the appointment of the Public School Commission. That Commission altered fundamentally the constitution of Winchester College and School. As Mr. Adams pathetically records, 'The connexion with New College is severed; the governing body is different; election-week is a thing of the past; the "ad Portas," the "Elizabeth and Jacob," the "Scrutiny," the festivities in College Hall—where are they?' And so on,

^{*} Dr. Keate, writing 30th Nov. 1818.

through many more terms of a dialect which makes a stranger wonder whether the English language is indeed spoken at Winchester. We may lament these changes as archæologists, but as upholders of the public school system, we feel, with Mr. Adams, that most of them were inevitable, and have worked nothing but good.

vas led

by

a

d's

ch,

ks

ad on.

n-

im he

on

d-

an

nd ed

n-

on

nis

ite

of nt

er

nd

18

th

of of

of

at

er

s,

g

1e

1e

n,

h

Under Drs. Ridding and Fearon the reputation of Winchester has not only suffered no diminution, but risen to a higher point than it ever reached, whether we judge by the test of popularity, or by that of University and other honours. Nor has the character of the school been injured or altered by the changes which have taken place. The boys are still governed by their own officers; they illustrate the Founder's motto by maintaining the old traditions of courtesy and simplicity; they are welcome wherever they go; and wherever they go, they look fondly back on the school that nursed their boyhood.

Our country, running shoulder to shoulder as it does with the most progressive nations, has never forgotten its past; the sponge of 1789 has not obliterated our ancient institutions. We can see in the Parliaments in which Wykeham sat as Chancellor the same principles and tendencies as those which rule us now; and in the Winchester of 1893 there is not merely a likeness to, but a true derivation from, the little band of Priests and Scholars who entered the College at 9 o'clock on the 28th of March, 1393, 'cum cruce erecta praecedente, solemni cantu, processionaliter gradiendo.'* Such as their Founder would have wished his sons to be, they still remain among all the changes which five full centuries have wrought in them and in all around them.

We shall not, we hope, be thought to give too much to sentiment in attributing to Wykehamists something more of the love of the school in which they were bred than is felt by all Public Schoolmen, each to his own school. We must not exaggerate the influence of admonitus locorum, or the emulation of great names, though the place is beautiful and venerable, and the roll of Wykehamist names is dignified. It is our belief that few Englishmen are altogether untouched by the thought of our national history; and that most Wykehamists are the better men for having been brought up in Winchester traditions, and made to feel that 'what we have been makes us what we are,' and that they and the school they love owe not only their origin but much of their character to the great Bishop whom they venerate as their Founder.

^{*} Moberly, p. 218.

ART. IV.—1. A Genealogical and Heraldic Dictionary of the Peerage and Baronetage. By Sir Bernard Burke, LL.D., Ulster King-of-Arms. London, 1893.

2. Complete Peerage of England, Scotland, Ireland, Great
Britain and the United Kingdom, extant, extinct, or dormant.

Vols, I.-IV. By G. E. C. London, 1887-1892.

TTO those who can penetrate the slender veil that surrounds the identity of the writer who is giving us the second of these works, the juxtaposition of the two will appear peculiarly appropriate. Nor will the name of Sir Bernard Burke, or even the official seal displayed on the frontispiece of his book. inspire a greater confidence than those three modest initials with which they so curiously contrast. It must not, however, be supposed that the two works are in rivalry. On the contrary, their spheres are radically distinct. Burke's 'Peerage' is for the public at large; and its lines are so familiar that they need no description. The monumental work of G. E. C. is intended primarily for the student; and while, on the one hand, more restricted in that it deals with peers alone, and not with their ancestry or their relatives, it is, on the other, wider in its scope, because it includes all dignities extinct, dormant, or in abeyance. The first attempt to produce a work of this character was made by Sir Harris Nicolas in his well-known 'Synopsis of the Peerage' (1825), which was edited anew as the 'Historic Peerage' by Mr. Courthope, Somerset Herald (1857). The want of a new and revised edition of so indispensable a work has long been admitted on all sides. Mr. Doyle in the 'Official Baronage of England' (1886) produced a book of much magnificence, based on unwearied original research, and possessing many distinctive features of great interest and importance. It is, however, a production sui generis, and remained only a torso, all peers below the rank of viscount having been excluded from its scope.

The field, therefore, is clear for the labours of G. E. C., who has now published the first half of a work which will be absolutely indispensable to every library of reference. We say this because completeness is, as the title implies, its essential feature. Where his predecessors confined themselves to the Peerage of England, he, on the contrary, gives us that of all three realms: he introduces for the first time the marriages of all peers; and he extends the skeleton accounts of them given by Nicolas and Courthope into brief biographies teeming with details, and enriched with many dates and facts that are nowhere else to be found. With a fund of original material at

his back, and assisted on moot points by the friendly hints of specialists, he enjoys peculiar advantages, of which he has made excellent use. To students, as well as to the general reader, the elaborate foot-notes with which the work abounds will prove its chief attraction. Instructive at one time, entertaining at another, they bear a certain personal impress which makes them quaint reading. But, having said this much in praise of the 'Complete Peerage,' we are bound to add that it has its The student will miss those exact references for every statement made which Dugdale was so careful to give, and which enables us to test his narrative at every point. Again, the indiscriminate use of italics and the dropping fire of notes of exclamation are a distinct offence against literary taste, and are rather wearisome than impressive. Moreover, it is evident that the feudal period is the weak point with the editor, who is most at home in the peerage of the last three centuries. He tells us, in his preface, that 'Mr. Courthope's work is an almost infallible guide as far as it extends,' and he has clearly treated it as such. The consequence is that, on some points, he is hopelessly behind the times. Thus, for instance, in a matter of such importance as the earliest writs of summons, he simply follows Courthope (1857), who had virtually copied from Nicolas (1825). Accordingly, his work is based throughout on the belief of Nicolas that there was no record of any valid writs of summons between the Parliament of Simon de Montford in 1264 and that held by Edward I. in 1295; also that the writs of 1294 and 1297 were for Parliaments of doubtful validity. All this has now been changed. It is, however, right to mention that the late Deputy-Keeper of the Records (Sir T. D. Hardy) held the same belief, as is evident from the Minutes of Evidence on the Hastings case (1841):-

⁴Q. Have you made any search whether there are any writs of summons to Parliament from the forty-ninth of Henry the Third to the twenty-third of Edward the First?

'A. I have.

he

).,

nt

nt.

ds

of

ly

en

k.

ls

er,

n-

e '

at is

ne

ot

er nt,

is

m

ld

n-

le

k.

h,

d

 \mathbf{d}

nt

10

æ

al

11

of

en

th

re

at

is

'Q. Do you find any?

'A. I do not.'

Moreover, in his 'Constitutional History' (1875) Dr. Stubbs himself followed Courthope, writing:—

'The importance of 1264 and 1295 arises from the fact that there are no earlier or intermediate writs of summons to a proper Parliament extant; if, as is by no means impossible, earlier writs addressed to the ancestors of existing families should be discovered, it might become a critical question how far the rule could be regarded as binding.'

Yet

Yet Sir Francis Palgrave had long before (1830) published his 'Parliamentary Writs,' containing those of summons to the Parliament of Shrewsbury in 1283. These, which everyone, we have seen, had completely disregarded, were, in 1876, sprung by Counsel on the Committee for Privileges, and accepted by them without question, and apparently without the slightest conception that they were establishing a precedent of the most momentous consequence. When it is added that the contested writs of 1294 and 1297 were also allowed to be put in evidence without question, and that the writ of 1283 affects a hundred baronies, it will be seen that the Mowbray decision (1877) unconsciously wrought a revolution, and that the history of baronies by writ must now be undertaken de This decision has also finally disposed of the 1264 novo. writs, which had been accepted in the cases of Le Despencer and De Ros, and has thereby raised a question of precedence as yet insoluble. But G. E. C. has overlooked the fact that the Hastings decision (1841) had already ignored those writs, and set up a wholly new date by recognizing sittings, in lieu of writs, in 1290. The barony is assigned by him, we find, to 1295, and by Courthope to 1264, though, as we have said, the authorized date is 1290 (18 Edward I.). These changes are so important, and are clearly so imperfectly understood, that we have thought it well to explain them in detail. Now that we have drawn his attention to the point, G. E. C. will doubtless rectify this shortcoming in his future volumes.

What we most admire in the 'Complete Peerage' is its outspoken honesty. In this its editor has faithfully followed in the footsteps of Sir Harris Nicolas, whose description of his

own principles we are tempted to quote:-

'To the merit of sedulous care, of rigid impartiality, and to having acted upon the resolution of not stating a single word which he did not believe to be strictly true, with the view of flattering the pride or gratifying the ambition of others, he conscientiously feels that he is entitled . . . He has felt that with respect to hereditary honours, more than with any other worldly possession,—

"Rien n'est beau que le vrai,"

and that to attribute a dignity to an individual who has no legal right to it, is a species of falsehood which, if not so injurious, is at least as morally culpable as any other deviation from truth.'

Very remarkable words for the period at which they were written (1825), when the study of genealogy may be said to have been still at its lowest ebb, and when peerage-writers had brought their craft into well-deserved contempt. That it is

now emerging from that position is largely due, we think it right to observe, to the efforts of a remarkable man. No writer treating of our subject can afford to pass over in silence the labours of Mr. Joseph Foster, whose merits the University of Oxford has lately recognized by the grant of an honorary degree. We know not whether to admire the more his industry or his honesty of purpose, and we trust that he may yet find time to renew the publication of his 'Peerage' (1880–1883), which was pitiless in its exposure of false pretensions, and undoubtedly compelled other editors to set their houses in order. Of this we shall, in due course, offer some striking

proofs.

shed

as to

very-

876.

and

t the

dent

that

o be

1283

bray

that n de

1264

ncer

ence

that

rits,

lieu

find,

said.

nges

ood.

Now

will

its

d in

his

ving

did

pride

ours,

legal

is at

were

d to

had

it is

now

As the 'Complete Peerage,' as yet, only covers the letters A to K, we have not before us its editor's verdict on all the doubtful titles, which now, happily, are few. We select, however, some test cases. Ulster recognizes the assumption by Lord Mar of the title 'Lord Garioch,' although he is significantly unable to assign it any creation: G. E. C., however, denies 'that any Parliamentary Barony of that name was ever vested in' the Earls of Mar. In this conclusion he had the support of the late Lyon [Mr. Burnett], although they both sided with Lord Mar in the matter of his earldom. Again, at the recent death of Lord Eglinton, it was asserted by those who claimed to be specially well informed that his father had succeeded in 1840 to the Scottish Earldom of Winton (1600). Ulster admits this succession, although the only proof is that, after the title had been dormant nearly a century, Lord Eglinton caused himself to be 'served heir male general' to the Earls of Winton: G. E. C. does not admit the validity of this proof, and pronounces the title of Earl of Winton (United Kingdom), conferred on the family in 1859, to have been 'a very im-We observe that proper one' under the circumstances. G. E. C. considers the attainder of 1716 (ignored by Ulster) a bar to the succession, though Mr. Riddell, we believe, held that it was saved by a specialty. Into the thorny subject of Scottish retours and services, their trustworthiness and their validity as proofs of extinctions, or even as instructing the right to a peerage, under the present dispensation, we do not propose to enter; but, as the sympathies of G. E. C. are clearly with the Scottish school, we do not think he is quite consistent in opposing himself to that unhappy system which was responsible (as even its advocates admit) for the fact that there was in Scotland no 'salutary check to undue assumption or usurpation.' Indeed, under 'Angus,' he boldly assigns that historic earldom to the Dukes of Hamilton, although they have, as yet, only claimed it. Turning to the Dukedom of Châtellerault. we find that, according to Ulster, it is vested in the Duke of Abercorn, while the Duke of Hamilton only 'claims' that ghost-like relic of a distant past. Neither of the Dukes, though holding between them nearly thirty Peerage dignities, will waive his claim to this shadowy title; and Sir Bernard, while assigning to his own countryman, 'in the point of honour, over all, the crowned escocheon of the French Duchy, engraves it also on the arms of his rival, observing with courtly dexterity that 'his Grace places' it there. But in the painfully candid 'Complete Peerage,' the Duke of Abercorn himself is only recognized as a claimant, an elaborate note reminding us that it is even quite doubtful whether the contested title was ever created at all. The last case we select is that of the exalted, but mysterious, foreign dignities claimed by the Earls of Denbigh. These noblemen are descended from 'the plain country gentleman who had the good luck to marry Buckingham's sister in the days of her poverty.' Rising with Buckingham, he became a peer, and, in due course, the family revealed a fact which they had hitherto kept to themselves; namely, that they were not of English origin, but were descended in the male line from the mighty House of Hapsburg. It was this illustrious descent that inspired the pen of Gibbon when, alluding to their pedigree of a thousand years, he wrote that 'the successors of Charles V. may disdain their brethren of England; but the romance of Tom Jones, that exquisite picture of human manners, will outlive the palace of the Escurial, and the imperial eagle of the House of Austria.' Lord Denbigh. according to Ulster King-of-Arms, is 'Count of Hapsburg, Laufenburg, and Rheinfelden,' and, as such (it was added), 'a Count of the Holy Roman Empire.' An eagle of Austria bears his arms, and the antiquity of his Countship is so great that its date of creation is unknown. Yet on all these honours G. E. C. is mute, though he hints in a foot-note that 'no mention of this illustrious origin is made in the Heralds' visitations.' In this, however, he misses the point, which is, that so late as 1619 the family, for reasons best known to themselves, entered a different pedigree, and traced their origin to a simple Englishman, 'John Feldinge.'

These cases are, of course, conspicuous, but the little points which tempt the honesty and test the accuracy of peerage-writers are more easily overlooked. Thus, while Lady Grey de Ruthyn, grandmother of the late Marquess of Hastings, was, according to Ulster, 'dau. of William Kelham, Esq.,' we learn from G. E. C. that her father was 'William Kelham, of

Ryton

ult,

e of

that

ugh

will

hile

ver

s it

rity

did

nly

that

but

igh.

tle-

rin

ame

vere

line

ious

heir

of

the

nan

the

igh,

urg,

, 'a

ears

that

ours

'no

lds'

is,

gin

ints

ters

de

vas,

we

, of

ton

Ryton on Dunsmore, co. Warwick, farmer.' A similar instance will, no doubt, be recognized under 'Egmont.' These are the things that inspire confidence, especially when fortified by a dense array of dates. If Sir Bernard inclines to mercy, and flatters the vanity of his patrons, the opposite tendency is visible in G. E. C. He takes a positive delight in explaining that Lord Belhaven was 'clerk to a wine merchant,' and Lord Borthwick's grandfather a bank manager; that he first Lord Kensington was the son of 'a purser,' that Lord Kingsale (1759–1776) was 'bred a carpenter,' or that the founder of Lord Carrington's family was 'a respectable draper at Nottingham.' For pretentious affectations he is pitiless. Thus he very sensibly observes of the title 'Ffrench':—

'The ludicrous mode of spelling the name with a double "f" has been stereotyped by its adoption in the patent of 1798. It probably arose from ignorance that the form of the capital "F" was that of the small "f" duplicated, . . . and, considering the spread of education, is not likely to occur again.'

We note, however, that under 'De Freyne' he accepts the statement that 'this title is merely an archaic form of the family name, otherwise de Freigne or de Frazinis.' Now this is simply absurd. 'The family name' was plain 'French,' and its derivation obvious. When Playfair composed his Baronetage as a monument of sycophantic folly, he discovered that Smith was derived from Smeeth, 'a level plain,' but confessed that he could find for Baker no possible derivation. In the same spirit the French family, discarding its obvious origin, assumed an imaginary descent from 'De la freigne' (De Fraxineto). Yet on the rage for 'De' in the last hundred years, G. E. C., we find, is unsparing in his sarcasm. Such titles as 'De Tabley,' 'De Mauley,' and 'De Ramsey' arouse in him the same scorn as 'a modern Gothic castle.' Even 'De Grey,' as he points out, is a modern innovation on Grey. Supplementing the cases he quotes, we may here attempt a list illustrating the manufacture of the imitation article in feudal nobility. The immortal creator of 'Jeames,' who from 'Yellowplush' became 'De la Pluche,' did but satirize that process of conversion which has changed the names of Smith, Bear, Hunt, Robinson, Aldworth, Smithson, Wilkins, Wigram, Morres, Lill, Smith, Supple, Mullins, Green, and Gossip, into Vernon, De Beauchamp, De Vere, De Grey, Neville, Percy, De Winton, Fitzwygram, De Montmorency, De Burgh, De Heriz, De Capell Brooke, De Moleyns, De Freville, and De Rodes. Bottom is indeed translated. The marvel marvel is that such tempting examples have not been more widely followed.

What can delay De Vaux and De Saye?

Fitzwalter, FitzOsbert, FitzHugh, and FitzJohn.'

The most monstrous of these cases is that of 'De Montmorency,' even Sir Bernard no longer venturing so much as to hint at the presumed descent, while, as for G. E. C., he laughs it to scorn. Indeed, no one knows what the descent was. And yet so perfect was this 'modern antique,' which dates, like others, from the Wyatville period, that the family assumed not only the arms, with the name, of that historic house, but also its motto, 'Dieu avde,' as if conscious that the proof of their claims was beyond the power of man. And now there has crept in the name of 'Bouchard,' the tenth-century patriarch of the French house. It was bound Have not the Douglases stereotyped in 'Sholto' to come. the legend of the 'dark-grey man,' the Ashburnhams in Bertram' the victim of the Conquest, and the Fieldings in 'Rudolph' their glorious descent? The mythical Otho is commemorated in the family nomenclature of Fitzgeralds, and in that of the Grosvenors has appeared a most traditionary 'Lupus.' Although this fashion is modern, it was strangely forestalled by the Percys, whose well-known 'Algernon' referred to the supposed sobriquet of their founder, and began some four centuries ago, though not, there is reason to believe, as a true Christian name.

An instance of the scrupulous exactitude of G. E. C. is afforded by the title of Warwick. He points out that this should rightly be Brooke and Warwick, the Earls taking precedence under Brooke (1746). Though adopting the style of Warwick (1759) alone, their petition for assigning to Warwick the precedence of Brooke was never, he observes, granted. He is further careful to explain that when these honours were conferred, the family, in spite of the flourishes of peerage-writers, were not even co-heirs of a younger branch of the old Earls of Warwick, whom therefore they in no way represent, although their coat-of-arms is decked with the swan and the bear of the Beauchamps, together, he adds, with the suggestive motto, 'Vix ea nostra voco.'

Nor is it only on names and styles that G. E. C. is outspoken. He reminds us of the origin of the Earldom of Orkney, thereby raising problems of atavism, and is careful to explain that so recently as 1747 the Viscountcy of Folkestone was purchased for 12,000% through the notorious Countess of

Yarmouth,

Varmouth, who 'is stated to have derived considerable sums from the sale of peerages.' Holles, we see, according to him, bought his barony (1616) through Buckingham for 10,0001. and the coveted Earldom of Clare (1624) for an additional 50001. We had imagined that the latter cost him more, but, though the purchase system was as fully recognized in the peerage then as in the army afterwards, the facts are not easy to ascertain. The Barony of Teynham (1616) was undoubtedly purchased, we believe, for 10,000l, but we have seen it stated that the Earldoms of Devonshire (1618), Northampton (1618), and Warwick (1618) cost no larger a sum. G. E. C., by the way, would seem to be unaware of Dugdale's letter on the difficulty (surmounted by a bribe to courtiers) of inducing Charles II. to recognize at the Restoration the suspicious Dudley patent of 1644. Again, under 'Guilford,' G. E. C. revives the North ecclesiastical scandals; though under 'Feversham' he does not allude to the troubles of Pope's 'cityknight,' the bearer of what Macaulay termed 'the once humble name of Duncombe,' Another unsparing foot-note is suggested by the restoration of the Earldom of Devon (1831), contrasting strangely with the famous panegyric of Gibbon on the Courtenays, who 'still retain the plaintive motto, which asserts the innocence, and deplores the fall, of their ancient house."

But the limit of what is permissible is reached in such comments as these, and we cannot but regret that this limit is passed in certain objectionable notes. It is possible to compile an honest Peerage without making it a chronique scandaleuse, and a work of reference is only disfigured by remarks which

offend against good taste.

nore

icv.

the

orn.

rfect

the

with

as, as

wer

the

und

lto '

in

s in

and

nary

gely ion'

gan

eve.

is is

this

pre-

e of

vick

He

vere

age-

old

ent,

the

tive

out-

of al to

tone

s of

uth,

A point upon which G. E. C. permits himself to speak strongly is the practice of calling out of abeyance certain ancient baronies-such as Vaux, Braye, Beaumont, Camoys, and Hastings-in favour of modern co-heirs, but distantly connected with them. A strong case, we may add, of contrasting treatment in the matter is afforded by the barony of Ferrers. With the exception of the short periods of abeyance 1646-77 and 1741-9, this barony existed continuously from 1299 to 1811. But it is not so much upon that ground that we select it as an ideal case for the determination of the abeyance as from the singular and happy circumstance that its senior co-heirs, the family of Ferrers of Baddesley Clinton, are also the heirs male of the great house of Ferrers, as is shown by G. E. C. in an admirable chart pedigree. It is hard enough for our ancient houses to trace an undoubted male descent from even the humblest Norman mentioned in Domesday Book, but Vol. 177.—No. 354. 2 D the the house of Ferrers was already mighty when the Conqueror filled the throne, and had attained the dignity of an earldom in the early days of Stephen. The heir-male of such a house as this would be worthy indeed to take his seat among the ancient barons of the realm. And yet the existence of such a line, outside the House of Lords, serves to remind us that, in England, a simple country gentleman can still look down in calm disdain, from the heights of immemorial noblesse, on the scramble for the newest of peerage dignities or for those baronetcies which are fast becoming the peculiar perquisite of the nouveau riche.

There are few points connected with the Peerage on which so much misconception prevails, among the general public, as the doctrine of abeyance. It appears to be usually considered immaterial whether a dignity is spoken of as 'dormant' or 'in abeyance.' Yet the two conditions are radically distinct. A dignity is said to be 'dormant' when it is in existence but is not assumed: it falls into 'abeyance' when, being descendible (as in the case of a barony by writ) to heirs-general, its heirs are two or more sisters, who, having an equal share in the dignity, can neither of them assume it. In Scotland, where the eldest daughter inherits such dignities, such a state of affairs cannot arise, but in England, where-except for vague traces of an esnecia or droit d'aînesse-the sisters rank equally, it has led to curious developments. Lady Otway-Cave, in whose favour the Barony of Brave was called out of abevance in 1839, had four sons and five daughters, so that the succession seemed well secured. Yet, at her death (1862), the barony fell into abeyance, and only emerged in 1879, on four of the five daughters having died childless, so that the fifth became sole heir. This case aptly illustrates the two methods by which the abeyance of a dignity can be 'determined,' viz. (1) by the intervention of the Crown in favour of one of the co-heirs; (2) by the natural extinction of all the co-heirs but one.

Instructive, and in many respects memorable, was the determination of the abeyance of the historic baronies of Mowbray and Segrave in favour of Lord Stourton (1877-8).

^{*} We are tempted to allude to the little known fact that the royal instructions to the special Commissioners, at the foundation of the order (1611), commanded them to 'proceed with none, except it shall appear unto you, upon good proof, . . . that they are, at the least, descended of a grandfather (by the father's side) that bore arms. And those admitted were, accordingly, gentry of high position and ancient lineage. The status of these early baroneteies is, therefore, quite different from that of those conferred, according to the modern practice, the persons who—to quote the 'Quadripartitus' [Ed. Liebermann], describing the novi homines of 1114—'vera morum generositate carentes et honesta prosapia, longo nummorum stemmate gloriantur. to the special Commissioners, at the foundation of the order (1611), commanded

ror

in in

as

ient

ine,

in

in

the

ose

e of

1 50

the

ered

'in

A

it is

ible

eirs

the

the

fairs

s of

led

vour

had

well

into

five

sole

hich

by

irs;

the

of

-8).

tions

proof,

her's

efore,

e, on

g the

sapia,

We

We have already referred to its bearing on the dates of baronies by writ, but we cannot pass over the novel principle it enunciates, with equal unconsciousness, in the doctrine of abeyance. Yet, apart from the points of law involved, it was eminently fitting that these ancient dignities should be 'called out' in favour of one whose ancestors had already been peers of the realm for more than four hundred years. Moreover, it served to accentuate the fact that the heirship in blood of that colluvies gentium which had made the fortunes of the Howards had long passed from the Dukes of Norfolk, although they had succeeded in diverting in their favour the historic estate and some of the dignities so acquired. So the anomalous Barony of Percy, vested in the Duke of Athole, similarly reminds us that the Dukes of Northumberland have ceased to represent the Percys, whose estates, however, they retain. It is, perhaps, as little realized that the right heir of Nelson is not the holder of the Nelson earldom, but Lord Bridport, who, as such heir, is Duke of Bronté. So also the Dukes of Marlborough are but the junior co-heirs of Churchill, the representation of his elder daughter (suo jure Duchess of Marlborough) being vested in the late Lord Convers. We are not told on what grounds the Princedom of the Empire is assigned with the Dukedom to a junior co-heir.

The consideration of the Mowbray descent brings us to a question of heraldry never yet, we believe, raised. Few coats are more familiar than that of the house of Howard, with its famous Flodden augmentation. For the benefit of non-heraldic readers we may explain that, like the scalp that adorns the Indian brave, an 'augmentation' granted for a victory commonly bore an armorial allusion to the vanquished leader. Accordingly, the Howards' victory at Flodden, and the death on the field of the King of Scots, were commemorated by the grant of an augmentation adapted from the King's arms, but so imperfectly described in the original as to make the accepted blazon somewhat open to question. Our point, however, is that this honourable distinction was granted to the Duke of Norfolk 'et heredibus suis temporibus futuris imperpetuum.' Dugdale renders this a grant in tail male, and the late Dr. Brewer, in his official calendar of the Patent Rolls (vol. i. p. 729), similarly terms it a 'grant in tail male.' Now this is a rather serious matter. Rightly or wrongly, Dr. Brewer enjoyed a great reputation, and it may appear incredible that he should so misread the grant. Yet there is no doubt about it; we have examined the original roll (Pat. 5 Hen. VIII., pars 2, m. 13, alias 18) more than once. It is possible that,—as in the grant of the 2 D 2 Dukedom,

Dukedom, which precedes it, and that of estates, which follows it, the habendum is to heirs-male of the body,-Dr. Brewer hurriedly took the words of inheritance to be the same in all. three cases. The augmentation, however, we have seen, was granted in fee simple, and would therefore descend to heirs general. In this case the Lords Mowbray and Petre are now alone entitled to it, and it is wrongly borne by the Duke of Norfolk, whose shield so proudly figures above the College of Arms, of which, as Earl Marshal, he is the hereditary head. The vision of the Earl Marshal of England summoning himself before his own court for using a coat to which he is not entitled, is irresistibly suggestive of a Savoy libretto. But, seriously speaking, if ours is not, as it surely must be, the right interpretation, the alternative is that the coveted distinction ought to be forthwith removed from the coats of Lord Mowbray and Lord Petre. But in either case, be it observed, it is wrongfully assumed by all the other Howards, although invariably assigned to them by Ulster and everyone else. The difference between a grant to a man and his heirs and a grant to all his race is well seen in the case of the Seymour augmentation (15 Aug. 1547), which was granted not only to the Duke and his heirs but also 'omnibus posteris suis totique familie.' We may add that the lions in this augmentation were not (as proudly blazoned by Ulster and others) 'lions of England,' but lions regardant (not gardant) and 'langued and armed with azur'-a correction which revives our doubts on the blazon of the Howard augmentation. We may further add, while on heraldry, that 'the family tradition' as to Joscelin of Louvaine transmitting to the Percys 'the ancient arms of Hainault' has long been conclusively disproved, and that, therefore, the arms of the Dukes of Northumberland are not those, as Ulster asserts, 'of the Duke of Brabant and Lovaine,' This reminds us of a story that will probably be new to our readers. The ambitious founder (né Smithson) of the present line of Dukes, boldly refusing a marquessate as a 'modern rank,' asked for a Dukedom of Brabant in right of his wife's descent. The king promised to 'give satisfaction to a very respectable person,' and eventually bestowed on him, as a compromise, that of Northumberland (1766).

But it is time that we should more particularly address ourselves to that familiar volume which is yearly issued under

the quasi-official ægis of Ulster King-of-Arms.

The late Sir Bernard Burke, whose name is a household word, was known as a most courteous official and as an amiable Peerage editor. His attitude towards the critical genealogist is well

ows

wer

was

eirs

won

e of

ead.

self

usly

ter-

ight

and

ully

ned

en a

well

47),

also

the

by

tion

ug-

the

to.

con-

ikes

the

tory

ious

ldly

dom

ised

ven-

um-

ress

nder

pold

able

st is

well

well shown by a letter he wrote renouncing a 'pretty little story' which he had annually repeated. 'It seems almost cruelty,' he wrote, 'in a learned Antiquary thus ruthlessly to pluck off such a green leaf from the Ancestral tree.' Out of touch with the modern school, he could not understand its passion for truth, its iconoclastic zeal for accuracy at all costs.

Of 'Burke's Peerage' we desire to speak with all fairness. It has long been the fashion to pour contempt on what a well-known genealogist has styled 'that gorgeous repertory of genealogical mythology,' and it cannot be denied that it was fully justified by the absurd fables which the Burke family, like the Randle Holmes in the past, have recklessly repeated in their productions. But, in justice, it is right to add that these fables were, at the worst, repeated rather than invented, and that slowly but steadily, under the pressure of ridicule and competition, they are being weeded out. The Temples, for instance, are no longer derived from Earl Leofric of Mercia, and the wild legend of the origin of the Berties has been so ruthlessly demolished that the pedigree now modestly begins about the time of Henry VII. This last instance calls to remembrance the article on 'Pedigrees and Pedigree Makers,' of sixteen years ago, in which the alleged origin of the family was ridiculed so ruthlessly. We have noted, in several other cases, the wholesome effects of that bitter attack, but some families, obdurate still, cling sturdily to the legends it exposed. The Ashburnhams, proud of their 'stupendous antiquity,' persist that 'there is scarcely a pedigree deduced from so remote a period so capable of proof as' theirs. We are still assured that Bertram de Esburnham was 'Sheriff of the counties of Surrey, Sussex, and Kent, and Constable of Dover Castle in the reign of King Harold,' and was beheaded, with his sons, by the Conqueror for his defence of that fortress. Sir Bernard would have found it difficult to name those 'ancient records and trustworthy writers' where any such facts are recorded or even hinted at. So also Lord Scarbrough's ancestry is still traced to 'Osbert de Lumley,' an impossible contemporary of the daughter of 'Etheldred' II., whose son was murdered by 'Leoferiso,' an equally impossible 'chaplain.'

We would, however, rather select some fables that we have ourselves noted as needing revision and correction. Of these the majority, as might be expected, are traceable to the old eagerness for descent from a companion of the Conqueror, and are the fruit of invention tempered only by the worthless 'Battle Roll.' How familiar they are, these old friends! Here is that 'very strong man'—not Mr. Thomas Atkins—

who 'landed in England with his master in the year 1066,' and 'protecting him with his shield from the blows of an assailant' at the Battle of Hastings, became known as Fortescu, and was progenitor to the family of that name. Here, too, is the patriarch of the St. Legers, though he now no longer gives his arm to the Conqueror as he steps ashore. Lord Bolingbroke's pedigree still begins with the Conqueror's 'grand master of the artillery and supervisor of the wagons and carriages;' while, disdaining the ordnance store department, Lord Alington seeks his progenitor in 'Sir Hildebrand de Alington'-a name that would have gladdened Sir Walter Scott-'under-marshal to William the Norman at the Battle of Hastings'; and Lord Verulam traces to 'Sylvester de Grymestone, . . . standardbearer in the army of William the Conqueror.' In this last case the descent was actually recognized in the preamble to the patent of creation (1719), in which the grantee (who had taken the name of Grimston) is asserted to be descended non interrupta linea from this hypothetical vexillifer! Some of these strange stories contain their own refutation; and the growing tendency to appeal to Domesday, in deference to modern historical research, is powerless to save them. Thus 'Sir Mauger le Vavasor,' we read, occurs in Domesday Book 'as holding in ehief of the Percys, Earls of Northumberland.' But the Percys were not then Earls of Northumberland; and if Sir Mauger was their tenant, he could not hold 'in chief,' and if he did he would not be a vavassor (i.e. an under-tenant). 'Sir Elias de Workesley,' the founder (longo intervallo) of the Worsleys, is unknown to chroniclers or to Domesday Book. The 'portgrave of Hastings' under the Conqueror, who is claimed as Lord Huntingdon's progenitor, is an official unknown to history; while as for Lord Derby's progenitor, who came over with his sons at the Conquest, their coming 'from Aldithley in Normandy' is one of the curiosities of geography.

Wilder, however, than the claims to descent from Norman invaders are those of the families who would 'go one better' by asserting an earlier origin. What is to be said to such a

passage as this?-

^{&#}x27;There still remain in England a few families, and Wolseley of Wolseley is one, that can prove by authentic evidence an unbroken descent from Saxon times, and show the inheritance of the same lands in the male line from a period long anterior to the Norman Conquest. A legend in the family narrates that their ancestor was given the lands of Wiselei (now Wolseley) for destroying wolves in co. Stafford, in the reign of King Edgar, when wolves were finally destroyed in England.'

and

lant'

was

s his

oke's

f the

hile,

eeks that

l to

Lord

lard-

last

the

ken

nter-

hese

ving

his-

uger

rcys

d he

s de

rave

ord

ory;

his

idy'

man

by

h a

y of

ken

ame

man

was

s in

ally

And

And so the 'authentic evidence' consists of 'a legend in the family,' itself dependent on another legend, namely, that wolves were 'finally destroyed in England' under Edgar, whereas we have seen them alluded to as in existence in twelfth-century charters, while they were not extirpated, of course, till an even later date. Equally absurd is the statement that the Derings are 'one of the very few houses still existing in England of undoubted Saxon origin; an origin confirmed not only by tradition, but by authentic family documents.' What possible family documents can establish the history of the house before the Conquest? So too, 'Randolphus de Trafford,' who lived ante Conquestum, may be left to the company of an impossible 'Eduni,' the 'earliest known ancestor' of the Trelawnys, and an equally impossible 'Hugh FitzBaldric, a Saxon thane.' As for the Pilkington who survived the Conquest as the Duc de Lévis weathered the Deluge, he is a 'worthy peer' of that early FitzWilliam who was already using an armorial seal when no one else possessed one, and who set up, 'engraven in brass,' some lines of sorry doggrel, thoughtfully composed in the English of a far later age.

But even when we pass to Ireland, where an Ulster should be specially at home, we meet under the Earldom of Fingall with a statement so grotesque as that 'so early as the eleventh century we find John Plunkett was seated at Beaulieu, or Bewley, co. Meath, the constant residence of the elder branch of his descendants.' What business either John or 'Beaulieu' could have had to be in Ireland at the time passes the wit of man to discover. But as his successor, a John Plunkett 'living in the beginning of the thirteenth century,' was father, we learn, of a man who sat in the Parliament of 1374, the family history was clearly unique. Now, why should this ancient and distinguished house be made ridiculous by such statements, when its name occurs both in England and Normandy in authentic records of the twelfth century, which are here completely ignored? Or, again, why should the ancestor of the Dillons, one of the Irish conquistadores, be assigned the absurd and impossible title of 'Premier Dillon, Lord Baron Drumrany'? And what authority can there be for 'Sir Geoffrey de Estmonte, Knt. of Huntington, in co. Lincoln, being one of 'the thirty knights who landed at Bannow' in Again, Sir Bernard had not learnt that the Burkes themselves are not descended, as stated under 'Clanricarde, from 'William Fitz-Adelm' [Audelin], governor of Ireland under Henry II., -a legend, as is now known, devoid of foundation. Lastly, under Leinster, 'Premier Duke, Marquess, and Earl Earl of Ireland,' we find the narrative still beginning with a story which is not only absolutely but also demonstrably false:—

'The FitzGeralds are descended from "Dominus Отно," who is supposed to have been of the family of the Gherardini of Florence. . . . This noble passed over into Normandy, and thence, in 1057, into England, where he became so great a favourite with Edward the Confessor, that he excited the jealousy of the Saxon thanes. However derived, his English possessions were enormous, which, at his death, devolved on his son, Walter FitzOtho, who, it is somewhat remarkable, was treated after the Conquest as a fellow-countryman of the Normans. In 1078 [sic] he is mentioned in Domesday Book as being in possession of his father's estates.'

Such circumstances are certainly 'somewhat remarkable,' their explanation being that they are at complete variance with the facts. 'Walterius filius Otheri' [sic], the undoubted founder of the house, first occurs in Domesday Book (not 1078, but 1086), where he is found in several counties as a tenant-in-chief. It nowhere styles him a son of Otho (of which 'Otto' was the Domesday form), and it does not state that his possessions had belonged to his father, but, on the contrary, proves them to have belonged to forfeited Englishmen. Thus the 'Otho' story is shown to be absolute fiction. And yet the editor had assured the public that he had 'endeavoured to render minutely correct the ancestral details of the lineages.' The same failing is at work throughout, the failing to distinguish contemporary evidence from irresponsible and worthless tradition.

To see how a genuine pedigree can and should be constructed, we need only turn to that of Lord Wrottesley, the work, no doubt, of that excellent antiquary, General Wrottesley, in which the family's possession of Wrottesley is carried up to within a century from the Conquest, while the pedigree itself is traced to the days of the Conqueror. Injustice is done to those who can prove such a pedigree as this, when the wild traditions we have glanced at are published as sober history; nor have families of undoubted antiquity, such as those of Lord Hereford or Lord Iddesleigh, anything to gain by appealing, in support of their earliest history, the former to pipe rolls which do not exist, and the latter to 'an ancient record' which

appears to have been nothing of the kind.

On the other hand, in two or three instances, the pedigree, instead of being carried too far, is not carried far enough. Under 'Delawarr' we read that the family of that name cannot be traced beyond 8 John (1206-7). Yet Jordan 'le Warre' (the 'De' was a later addition) occurs under King Stephen (1153). Lord Sudeley is only traced to John de Sudeley of 1140, though John's

John's descent in the male line, through the Earl of Hereford (the Confessor's nephew), from the Counts of the Vexin in the tenth century, is fully recognized by genealogists. Unhappily, there was a break in the descent so recently as 1797, the present Lord Sudeley being, in the male line, a Hanbury. But the early pedigree is none the less remarkable, and may be compared with that of the old Earls of Dunbar in the sister realm, for long continuance of male descent. Again, the founder of the present Berkeleys is bluntly introduced as 'Robert Fitzhardinge,' who, like Melchizedek, had no father, although competent genealogists now hold, and the late Mr. Freeman thought it 'in the highest degree probable,' that he was the son of Harding, son of Eadnoth, the latter being, the Professor held, no other than Eadnoth the Staller, a magnate under Edward the Confessor. The probability of so unique a descent might at least have been referred to, as might also the probable origin of the founder of the English Courtenays; an origin which, a critical genealogist confessed, 'there is every reason to believe.' over, in asserting that 'there is no mention of' the great name of Neville in Domesday, Sir Bernard, it is true, followed

Dugdale; but the statement is contrary to fact. It is, of course, matter of common knowledge that, both in and out of the Peerage, there are many families who can trace their ancestors at a time when the Howards were as yet unknown. Desperate efforts, however, have been made to provide them with a fitting origin; and Ulster, we see, stubbornly adhered to that wildly impossible story which is really too absurd to The early part of this precious concoction is based on 'undoubted evidence,' the evidence of-'Ingulph'! The latter part has been publicly derided by the best possible authority, Mr. Walter Rye. 'Surely,' he observed with much truth, 'the pedigree of the head of the College of Arms himself should be above suspicion.' His criticism was strenuously supported, in the 'Athenæum,' some six years ago, when it was urged that 'it is a scandal to our historical and antiquarian scholarship that the ridiculous farrago of this "mythical descent" should be thus annually repeated to the public in a quasi-official form.' And yet Ulster King-of-Arms persisted in publishing this nonsense. As might be expected, the 'Almanac de Gotha' accepts his statements as official, and duly proclaims the Howards a 'maison féodale Anglo-Saxonne que l'on fait remonter à Leofric ... vers 950.' It is not, we shall find, in pedigree alone that revision is required in the history of the ducal house of Norfolk.

A pleasing contrast is afforded by the pedigree of the Duke

tory

o is nce. 057, the owhis

hat man ook

the der but ief.

to ory red

at

ted, no in to self

e to vild ry; ord ing, olls

ree,
igh.
inot
(the
53).

ugh m's of Fife. Its rise and fall is so curious a story that we may be pardoned for giving it in detail. When William Duff was raised to the peerage in 1751, he selected the titles of Viscount MacDuff and Earl Fife; 'evidently,' as G. E. C. observes, 'to indicate a descent from the ancient Earls of Fife of the house of Macduff.' The same descent was implied in the Marquessate of Macduff and Dukedom of Fife granted so recently as 1889. Accordingly, till some years ago, Ulster gave as the origin of the family:—

'This noble family derives from Fyfe Macduff, a chief of great wealth and power, who lived about the year 834, and afforded to Kenneth II., King of Scotland, strong aid against his enemies the Picts.'

This descent was traced through the Duffs of Muldavit, of whom the first, living in 1404, was said to be a cadet of the old Earls of Fife. Baird, who wrote a genealogical history of the family about 1773, set forth the pedigree without question, as did others; in 1783 Lord Fife procured a charter giving the name of MacDuff to the port he had created at Doune; and, finally, the family, who had adorned their mausoleum with inscriptions proclaiming it and with the crest of the old Earls of Fife. ventured on a crowning step. Incredible though it may seem, 'a fine stone effigy, with a singularly well-preserved inscription,' erected, it is supposed, to an Innes of Innes about 1539, was removed from Cullen Church to the Duff mausoleum, where, by altering the inscribed date to 1404 (in Arabic numerals!) it was made to figure as that of the first Duff of Muldavit. No less an authority than the late Mr. Stodart, Lyon Clerk Depute, informed G. E. C.' that this was probably done in 1792 'to add to the glory of [the then] Lord Fife'! Moreover, an imitation antique inscription was cut at the same time recording in detail the spurious descent. The credit of unmasking these remarkable proceedings belongs to Mr. William Cramond, who, with indefatigable zeal, established the real facts. The descent from the old Earls of Fife was soon seen to be untenable, but the family was still traced to Duff of Muldavit in 1404, and the 'Almanac de Gotha' preserves this version; * Mr. Cramond, however, eventually disproved this also, and showed that the family could not be traced beyond the middle of the seventeenth century. Ulster has at last surrendered at discretion, and now begins the pedigree with Adam Duff, who died between 1674 and 1677, and 'laid the foundation of the prosperity of the family.'

transit

^{*} It is only just to Mr. Foster to mention that he from the first, in his 'Peerage,' had independently refused to admit even the Muldavit descent.

transit gloria mundi. If, as we presume, the present pedigree appears with the sanction of the Duke of Fife, he has set an example to others, by this frank recognition of facts, which we

hope may be widely followed.

The story of the translated effigy and the manufactured genealogical inscription is not, though startling, unique. Tampering has not been confined to the will or to the parish register. Only students of genealogy, perhaps, remember the famous Coulthart imposture, in which the evidences for the pedigree were one and all forged, 'monuments to the imaginary . line of the Coultharts' being erected in two Scottish churchyards in the shape of altar-tombs commemorating successive lairds of Coulthart! Even this performance was eclipsed by the Deardens at Rochdale, who, according to a writer in the 'Gentleman's Magazine' (1852), had constructed in Rochdale Church an imaginary 'family chapel,' with sham effigies, slabs, and brasses to the memory of imaginary ancestors. This statement, we may add, was actually true, the work having been executed about 1847; and although most of these monstrosities have now been buried, 'five imitation antiques' were allowed to remain. We can supplement these cases by yet another. An American family of Sears, in search of English ancestors, laid violent hands on a family of Sayer, formerly of Colchester, and having constructed for themselves a spurious descent from that house, obtained permission to erect in St. Peter's, Colchester, a brass (appropriate metal!) recording that descent—and testifying to a human weakness ære perennius.

One of the victims to this weakness was Lord Brougham himself. It was said of another ardent Radical, who had compiled a voluminous genealogy, that he sat under the largest family tree to be found in Christendom. But Lord Brougham's tree, in its rapid growth, rivalled the Indian mango. Perhaps the 'Dictionary of National Biography,' to which G. E. C. triumphantly appeals, errs on the side of incredulity; but those who are curicus in such matters may turn with advantage to the 'Gentleman's Magazine' for 1848, where they will find that the same romantic genealogist was a friend of Mr. Dearden and of Lord Brougham, and will read the wondrous story of the so-called 'Crusader's tomb.' It is right to add that these phantasies receive no countenance from the officers of the College of Arms, an institution never more efficient or more honourably conducted

than under its present head.

What Mr. Cramond accomplished for the pedigree of the Duke of Fife, Mr. Foster did for that of Lord Tweedmouth. Certainly there has been, in our time, no genealogical question

of

Jister pedi-, and Sic

he.

was

unt

e of

sate

889.

n of

reat

d to

the

hom

Carls

mily

did

ame

ally,

ions

Fife,

eem,

ion,

was

e, by

was

ss an

rmed

o the

tique

l the

kable

inde-

n the

mily

nanac

even-

d not

in his

ransit

of purely academic interest so bitterly and so stubbornly contested as that of the Marjoribanks pedigree 'recorded' in the Lyon Office. On the creation of the Tweedmouth peerage in 1881, the pedigree of the new peer was duly communicated to the two rival Peerage editors, Sir Bernard Burke and Mr. Foster. The former, after his wont, published it without question; the latter, as a critical genealogist, deemed it unsatisfactory, and warned his readers that it was wanting in proof and therefore doubtful. Thereupon the Lyon Clerk Depute ridiculed him o for daring to question a 'proved and registered pedigree.' Despising him as a merely 'English' genealogist, the Scottish authorities were wholly unprepared for the result of this rash challenge. One after another they entered the field to be overwhelmed in turn. Mr. Foster was found, to their great surprise, to have at his fingers' ends their public and burghal records. He could tell them more than they ever knew; and he tore their pedigree (or rather pedigrees) to shreds. straightforward onslaught contrasted strongly with the pitiful subterfuges of his opponents. As an example of these he was accused by Lyon of fabricating a date (1688) which 'occurs in no printed account of the family except Mr. Foster's,' for the purpose of demolishing it. As a matter of fact, the date, so far from being his fabrication, was given by Ulster in his 'Peerage,' and remains there, it will be found, to this day! Mr. Foster's determined honesty had, of course, made many enemies, who joined eagerly in the attack; but, finding it at length useless to uphold the discredited descent, they coolly abandoned it as a matter 'of little interest to genealogists'! Our readers may be left to draw their own conclusion, and to estimate from this the value of pedigrees 'proved and registered' in the Lyon Office.

We shall have, however, to wait till Mr. Foster resumes the publication of his 'Peerage' for a trustworthy account of Lord Tweedmouth's descent, Ulster having altered it, it is true, but

only in matters of detail.

The Marjoribanks pedigree reminds us, by the way, that there are several problems of Scottish genealogy for light on which we turn in vain, as ever, to Ulster's pages. We still read of Lord Polwarth that 'by failure of the male heirs of Sir Robert Scott of Murdockstone (from whom derives the noble house of Buccleugh), his lordship claims the chieftainship of all the Scotts in Scotland; 'and yet, under 'Napier and Ettrick,' our accommodating King-of-Arms traces the male heirs of Sir Robert, through the Scotts of Howpaisley and Thirlestaine, and duly assigns them the Scott coat with the Murdockstone bend. Turning to another coveted heirship, the male representative of the

con-

the e in

d to

ster.

the

and

efore

him

ree.

ttish

rash

be

reat

ghal

and

His

tiful

was

rs in

the

o far

age,

ter's

who

ss to

as a

y be

s the

s the

Lord

, but

that

t on

still

f Sir

oble

of all

ick,

Sir

and

end.

ve of

the

ice.

the Stewards (Stuarts) of Scotland, we find Lord Galloway's undoubted ancestor, Sir William Stewart of Jedworth (executed in 1402), asserted to be the son of Sir John 'of Jedworth, whose father was slain at Falkirk in 1298. But there is well known to be no proof that Sir William was the son of this Sir John; the missing link has still to be found, and even a generation, it may be, is omitted. It is unfortunate also that the 'Peerage' opens with a characteristic passage (under 'Abercorn') where, instead of frankly deriving the Hamiltons from Walter FitzGilbert, who first appears on the 'Ragman Roll' of homage (1296), Sir Bernard temporized after his wont. He discreetly dropped the time-honoured legend, originating in, or commemorated by, the crest of the family; but, while declining 'to trace the exact descent of the illustrious Scottish house of Hamilton from the great and powerful stock of the ancient de Bellomonts (sic), Earls of Leicester, he left it to be supposed that somehow or other the Hamiltons did descend from that 'magnificent Norman race.' And he persisted in beginning their definite pedigree a generation too soon.

From Scottish pedigrees we pass to two Scottish titles. In alluding to the Earldom of Mar, we shall not enter, of course, into the merits of the original decision by the House of Lords (1875), which, as Lord Selborne and the Lord Chancellor observed in the 1877 debate, 'must be considered as final, right or wrong, and not to be questioned.' Our remarks will here be confined to the 'Restitution Act' of 1885, based as it is on what one of its ardent advocates has described as 'a hypothesis which can with difficulty be apprehended—even as a legal fiction-by a Scottish historical antiquary.' Mr. Goodeve Erskine, having assumed the title, had declined to drop it, though the House of Lords, holding rightly 'that his assumption was without warrant' (as Lord Crawford wrote), had ordered him to do so when appearing before them. raises the whole question of the assumption of Scottish titles, and, as strenuous efforts have been made to represent the Restitution Act as the sanction of this assumption, it is important to observe that, on the contrary, it styled Mr. Goodeve Erskine by that name throughout, thereby denying the validity of his assumption (1866-1885), and involving the corollary that but for this Act he would not be Earl of Mar.

And now for the Act. As it was impossible to undo, at least in form, what the Lords had done, it was resolved by Lord Mar's supporters to resort to what his own counsel termed 'an equivocation on the facts of the case.' The letter of the Lords' resolution was accepted, while repudiating the rationes on which alone it was based. All that was needed was to assume that

the

the Earldom of Mar could not possibly have been created in 1565 (which was precisely what the Committee decided, teste Lord Crawford, it had been), and that, consequently, Lord Kellie had been awarded a dignity which, as G. E. C. (we are sorry to see) puts it, was 'apparently a creation by the Committee for Privileges in 1875.' Although this language betrays the absurdity of the position (the Committee of course awarding an existing, not creating a new, dignity), it was treated as a brilliant discovery that the 'ancient' Earldom of Mar was vested in Mr. Goodeve Erskine, and on this daring petitio principii the Act of 'Restitution' was based. As might be expected, a measure which avowedly represented an 'equivocation' failed to satisfy either party, because, while virtually revoking the decision of 1875, it pretended to do nothing of the kind. Hence protests at Holyrood, hence debates at Westminster, and all because clamour and agitation had been allowed to render ridiculous a decision which they could not reverse.

The Mar case, apart from the points of law involved, evoked a good deal of false sentiment, owing to the apparent injustice of a title with which the Erskines were connected 'through a lass,' being retained by them as heirs-male instead of passing to the heir-general. But the peculiarities of the Scottish system have wrought in other cases the same or greater injustice, without protest being made. The principle was applied to the Crown itself by the act of settlement (1373); and another Erskine title, the Earldom of Buchan, although nominally the old Earldom of 1469, has been held, since 1695, by a branch of the family which, as G. E. C. observes, is 'in no way connected with any of the previous Earls,' to the detriment of their descendants and heirsgeneral. This case, therefore, is even stronger than that of Mar, to which Moray, however, is a good parallel. The earldom of that name came through an heiress to the family who now possess it, but they diverted its descent in favour of their heirsmale. It is alleged that this was done by a re-grant of the 'comitatus,' upon resignation, in 1611; but when the right to the title came incidentally (not on a remit) before the House of Lords (1790-1793), the decision in favour of Lord Moray was based, it is virtually known, not upon this charter (1611)which according to the Sutherland decision (1771) could not have carried the honours-but upon the same principles as the Mar decision (1875) itself. And indeed, apart from those principles, the construction of these charters, at the very period of transition, is notoriously a moot point. The parallel is carried further by the fact, that however the charter might operate on the honours, it undoubtedly vested the estates in the heir-male. In England, owing to the absence of the ted

ed.

ord

are

m-

ays

ing

s a

was

itio

be

VO-

ally

r of

est-

wed

ked

tice

ass,

the

ave

out

own

itle,

n of

ich,

the

eirs-

t of

dom

now

eirs-

the

t to

e of

was

1)-

not

the

hose

riod

l is

s in the stem system of resignation and re-grant, such cases do not arise, the only successful attempt in that direction being the special Arundel entail of 1627. Yet, through the whole of the seventeenth century, the main issue in peerage cases was the famous doctrine that an earldom 'attracted' a barony in fee; that is, diverted its descent in favour of the heirs-male. 'The British Solomon,' we may add, curiously justified that name by dividing the contested dignity in such cases as Abergavenny (1604), Roos (1617 and 1618), and Offaley (1620), awarding a barony to the heir-male and another to the heir-general. Thus, he divided the barony of Roos into those of 'Roos' and 'Roos of Hamlake.' Yet in this he only followed the precedent which gave us such twin dignities as Dacre of the North and Dacre of the South; and it is practically the same illogical and bewildering compromise which has given us in our own day two Earls of Mar. And yet it was James himself who gave us the sound maxim that 'it cannot stand with the ordour and consuctude of the countrie to honnour two earlis with ane title.'

Our next Scottish dignity is the barony of Ruthven of Freeland. Now this is a subject of some delicacy, on which it is, unhappily, necessary to speak plainly. This dignity is on a different footing from any other in the Peerage, and is the greatest of all its curiosities. For, wrongfully assumed in the first instance, it has been wrongfully borne ever since. This fact, we hasten to add, is no new discovery: Riddell, to whom Sir Bernard appeals as 'the most eminent of Scottish Peerage lawyers,' went into this matter in his 'Remarks on Scotch Peerage Law (1833);' and though denouncing the 'apologies' for the assumption of the title as 'too trivial and flimsy for criticism,' he condescended to expose them in all their absurdity.

The facts, apart from these 'apologies,' are few and simple enough. The barony is said to have been created 'in 1651,' but even the date of the patent is unknown. The original document has long been lost—it is not proved how or when—and, as it was never registered, nor a copy made of it, and as moreover there is no 'docquet or sign-manual thereof,' its contents are wholly unknown.* Under these circumstances there is unconscious satire in the motto of the family: 'Deeds show.' For there is no adminicle of evidence to show what the limitation of the dignity really was.

When this is the case, as is well known, the law presumes a limitation to heirs-male of the body, this being, as Lord Cranworth observed in the Herries case (1858), 'a settled rule of

^{*} It is very singular that if, as alleged, it was preserved for a hundred years, no attempt was ever made to set its terms on record, as was done in the similar case of Rollo, a barony created the same year (1651).

law.' This would agree with the only clue we possess to the terms of the patent; namely, a contemporary MS. in the Advocates' Library, which states that the limitation was to 'heirs-male.' On the extinction, however, of the direct male line in 1701 or 1704 (for even this date is uncertain) the title, though described as 'extinct' in Crawfurd's 'Peerage of Scotland' (1716), seems to have been tentatively and fitfully assumed by the last lord's youngest sister, who had succeeded to his estates. At her death the estates passed to their nephew Sir William Cunningham, who, already heir of line, became thereby heir of tailzie as well to the last lord. Yet he did not assume the title. But his cousin and heir, Mrs. Johnston, tentatively revived the assumption, and-receiving a summons to the coronation of George II .- 'in a jesting way,' according to Lord Hailes, 'she said that this was her patent, and that she would preserve it as such, in her charter-chest.' It was not, however, till 1764 that Douglas-'a most indifferent peeragewriter,' says Riddell, 'and little, indeed, to be ever trusted'gave a half-hearted recognition to this curious assumption. And now comes the striking point. In order to homologate the assumption and present a consistent story, the pedigree had to be falsified by cutting out both 'Baroness' Jean and Sir William Cunningham, and passing straight to 'Baroness' Isabel! The existence of the two former being a fatal flaw in the case, they were carefully kept out of sight by Douglas, Wood, and Ulster in turn down to 1883. But by that time Mr. Joseph Foster had unearthed these individuals, and had openly impugned the assumption. Accordingly, Sir Bernard had to shift his ground; and, in his 'Peerage' for 1884, the account of the assumption was entirely re-written, and the old 'apologies' for it revived, thereby revealing the fact that apology was needed. We need only print side by side the two versions of the critical period in order to prove our point:-

Burke's Peerage, 1883.

'DAVID, 2nd baron, a lord of the Treasury, died without issue in 1701, when the barony devolved upon his niece, The Hon. Isabella Ruthven, as 1st baroness.' BURKE'S PEERAGE, 1884.

'DAVID, 2nd lord. . . . He entailed his estates, etc. etc. . . . Dying unmarried 1701, he was succeeded by his youngest sister JEAN, who as BARONESS RUTHVEN made up her titles to the estates,* and whose right to the peerage was unchallenged in her lifetime. She d. unm. 1722, and the next holder of the title was her niece ISABEL, BARONESS RUTHYEN.

^{*} Yet it was only as 'Mrs. Jean Ruthven' that she petitioned the Court of Session to record the entail, 1721.

But even now the intervention of Sir William Cunningham between the two 'Baronesses' is carefully ignored.

the

the

s to

nale

itle,

cot-

fully

eded

hew

ame

not

ston,

nons

ding

she

not,

age-

d'_

tion.

e the

id to

Sir

ess'

w in

glas,

time

had nard

, the

e old that

two

. He

was

sister

HVEN

ites,

erage

life-

d the

s her

urt of

But

We cannot, of course, enter here into all the details, but must refer the future editor of 'Burke,' or anyone else desirous of really learning the truth, to an elaborate article on the subject in Part xiii. of Mr. Foster's Collectanea Genealogica (1884), where all the 'apologies' are discussed seriatim, and clearly shown to be inept.

This title, in fact, is a solitary survival of those assumptions of Scottish dignities which formed in the last century so grave a scandal that repeated but unsuccessful efforts were made to check it. Owing to the peculiar Scottish system these assumptions passed 'unchallenged' unless a counter-claim brought the question to an issue, or votes tendered in respect of them turned the scale at an election. This was frankly admitted by the Lord Clerk Register in his evidence before the Select Committee of 1882:—'As the law now stands, the title may be held for generations by persons who have never taken any steps whatever to establish their claim.' * While Lyon himself. though devoted to the system, conceded that 'in Scotland there are individuals as to whom it may be matter of dispute as to whether they are Peers.' † Even in England, though the intervention of the writ of summons offers a safeguard against such assumptions, there is no such check in the case of a Baroness; and it is a most remarkable fact that there were at least three wrongful assumptions of that dignity during the last century. Baroness Cromwell,' by whom that title was erroneously assumed from 1687 to 1709, actually walked as a Peeress at the funeral of Queen Mary and the coronation of Queen Anne; 'Baroness Dudley' assumed that title from 1757 to 1762; and 'Baroness le Despencer,' as Lady Austen styled herself from 1781 to 1788, was also a title erroneously assumed. All three cases will be found in the admirable work of G. E. C., where the origin of the error in each case is explained. The whole subject of dignities assumed, recognized, and even created in error, is one of curious interest. Thus the Scottish Barony of Lindores was successfully assumed, like that of Ruthven, from 1736—and those who assumed it allowed to vote—till the accident of the vote being challenged at a close election led to the assumption being stopped in 1793. So the Barony of Willoughby of Parham was actually held from 1679 to 1765 by a younger son, summoned in error, and his descendants. But this being an English barony, it is held that the writ of

^{* &#}x27;Minutes,' 71.

[†] Ibid., 185.

summons, though issued in error, created a dignity; and the same famous doctrine of the 'ennobling of the blood,' by (rightly or wrongly) sitting in the House, is responsible for the existence of three baronies—Clifford (1628), Strange (1628), and Percy (1722)—created by writs of summons issued under a misapprehension. With these we may perhaps compare the Irish Barony of 'La Poer,' allowed to Lady Waterford and her heirs in 1767, although it was limited to heirs-male by the creation of 1535. It would thus be virtually parallel to the

cases of Cromwell (1687) and Percy (1722).

Passing from Scotland to Ireland, we observe with satisfaction that G. E. C. dwells, in his preface, on our imperfect knowledge of its peerage, of which 'no comprehensive account exists.' The subject has, indeed, been strangely neglected, and, when investigated by a competent scholar, will yield extremely interesting and somewhat surprising results. But although so well informed on the peerage of modern times, G. E. C., as we have said before, is not at home in the feudal period. He has therefore found himself dependent partly on a worthless and misleading list of the early peerage in the 'Liber Hibernie,' and partly on the works of Mr. Lynch, the ablest writer, no doubt, upon the subject, but, we must remember, a partisan. Lynch wrote with the object of establishing, as a rule of law, a presumption in favour of heirs-male in the descent of Irish dignities. Betham, in spite of his official position, was so poor an advocate of the opposite view, that we cannot wonder at G. E. C. following Lynch throughout But this is a matter that cannot be narrowed to a question of decisions and precedents. A broader view will take us deep down among the roots of Anglo-Irish difficulties. The native tribal principle, invincibly in favour of agnates, strove, here as elsewhere, against the principles of English law. We imagine that at first the latter prevailed, especially within the pale, but with the ebb of the English rule the native principle revived; and even the Anglo-Normans, 'Hibernis Hiberniores,' adopted, in the wilder parts, the old tribal system-Bourke (MacWilliam), Bermingham (MacPhioris), FitzMaurice (MacMorrish), for instance -or at least elaborately entailed their estates upon heirs-male. Thus there arose, in practice, a system of male succession, although, in our opinion, it had not prevailed at first. It is largely due to this development that the houses of the conquistadores present so long and illustrious a descent in the male line, instead of merging in heiresses, as in England would have been their fate.

G. E. C. adopts for his sheet-anchor the ranking of the Irish peers

the

by

for

8),

ra

the

her

the

the

on

ge

ts.'

ely

SO

as

He

ess

e,

no m.

, a

sh

or

at

e-

ots

n-

st

he

of

he

er

g-

ce

e.

n,

is

sle

re

h

TS

peers at Windsor, when summoned there by Henry VII. (1489), combining it with the ranking by the 'Lords Commissioners' in 1615. From these rankings he endeavours to determine the probable antiquity of their dignities. But here we have the old mistake of trusting to secondary and late evidence instead of investigating the facts for oneself. The enemy of peerage history is peerage law. We are confronted under 'Athenry' with the difficulties to which it leads. The right order of precedence was Athenry, Kingsale, Kerry, upon which G. E. C. remarks:—

"As the Lords Commissioners (in 1613 [rectè 1615]) admitted that "the FitzMaurices, Lords of Kerry and Lixnaw, proved their possession of that dignity to be as ancient as the Conquest" (i.e. 1172), and as "the same Lords Commissioners adjudged the antiquity of the Lords Courcy of Kingsale to be still greater than that of the Lords Fitzmaurice of Kerry," it follows that the antiquity of the Barony of Athenry, which immediately precedes that of Kingsale, cannot be later than 1172; in which same year (according to their Lordships' authority) we must suppose the Barony of Kingsale, as well as that of Kerry, to have been also created, for certainly no such Baronies could have been created before the Conquest above named."

The writer fails to perceive that what really 'follows' is the reductio ad absurdum of the Lords Commissioners' ruling. Under 'Kerry' he repeats his dilemma, again observing that '29 May, 1223, which date is, in all probability, that of the origin of the peerage of Kingsale,' is incompatible with the above conclusion. The origin of the difficulty is, we would suggest, that whereas, in England, the 'creation' of a barony is reckoned to date from the first proved writ of summons, in Ireland the writ of summons has been comparatively ignored, and dignities traced to the earliest period at which their possessors were barons by tenure. This principle, though pressed upon them, has always been rejected by our own House of Lords, so that the apparent superior antiquity of Irish over English baronies has no foundation in fact.

The most famous, probably, of early Irish dignities is the celebrated Barony of Kingsale. Who has not heard of its thirty lords descended in direct male succession from that John de Courci, 'Earl of Ulster,' whose wondrous deeds procured for them the right of remaining covered in the presence of the king? But it is not only 'butter and patriots' that are produced in county Cork: it has also given us in the Courci myth the wildest of peerage fictions. It is certain, from the testimony of Giraldus, that John de Courci left no heir; it is, further, certain that his wondrous geste, so elaborately related by Sir

Bernard Burke, is sheer and impossible fiction; and it is, lastly, certain that the alleged privilege of remaining covered in the royal presence is an even later addition to this late legend. And yet Sir Bernard-though he now admits that John de Courci died childless-continues to inform us that 'Lord Kingsale enjoys the hereditary privilege (granted by King John to De Courcy, Earl of Ulster) of wearing his hat in the royal presence.' No instance, we believe, is known of this 'right' being exercised before the days of William III., although it had become familiar by the middle of the last century, when Montagu wrote to Horace Walpole, of the new Lord Kingsale (1762), that 'our peers need not fear him assuming his privilege of being covered, for till the King gives him a pension he cannot buy the offensive hat.' G. E. C. waxes merry over what he terms the 'hat trick,' but it was not he who detected the flaws in the Courci legend, nor, we shall

find, when left to himself, has he escaped disaster.

In spite of what Planché described as their 'worthless and unmannerly' privilege, and of the falsehood of its alleged origin, the Lords Kingsale were undoubtedly seated in their baronial territory of 'Courcy's' from the days of Henry III., and possess a peerage dignity of great antiquity. But what their title really was no one seems to know. It has bewildered G. E. C., who sets forth its various forms, but himself adopts, all through, that of 'Baron Kingsale and Ringrone.' Ulster, on the other hand, adopted the incongruous style, 'Lord Kingsale, Baron Courcy of Courcy, and Baron of Ringrone.' The true title, however, was not 'Kingsale' but 'Courcy,' and so late as 1613 the then peer sat in Parliament as 'Lord Courcy of Ringroane.' In the list drawn up preliminary to that Parliament he is styled 'the Lord Baron Cursie'; and 'Lord Courcy,' simply, was the style by which these peers had always been known. The creation, however, of a Viscount Kingsale, in 1625, was resented by Lord Courcy as an encroachment on his own territory, and, in 1627, he obtained from Royal Commissioners a misleading report 'that the Lord Courcy was not only Lord Courcy, but Baron of Kingsale and also of Ringrone.' In 1634 the Lords' Journals still style him 'Lord Courcy' in their list, but eventually 'Kingsale' in lieu of 'Courcy' was adopted as the title of their peerage dignity, which, however, continues to be but one.

What is the date of its creation? Our readers might imagine that if anyone knew the date of the Premier Barony of Ireland, it would have been Ulster King-of-Arms. Not so. It used to be alleged (and is still in 'Lodge' and some popular 'Peerages')

that the Barony of 'Kingsale' dates from 1181. This date Sir Bernard had abandoned, although he still asserted that John de Courci 'was created in 1181 (being the first Englishman dignified with an Irish title of honour) Earl of Ulster.' The objection to this date, as an Irishman might say, is that John was never created Earl of Ulster at all. But, as to the barony, we are now told, both in the narrative and at its foot, that its 'creation' was in '1223.' Now, in this case, G. E. C. is in complete accord with Ulster. He repeatedly traces 'the peerage of Kingsale' to a grant by Henry III., 29th May, 1223, which he treats as a fixed point bearing upon other dates. In our experience an exact date is hardly ever an invention: it has an origin somewhere. But this date long baffled us. Its actual origin is a marvel. Lodge had written, in his Irish 'Peerage,' that

te

at

n

is

.,

n

es

ot 11

ď

dir

it

d

s,

n

e,

e

IS

of

1-

n

n

is

j---

n

r

d

:5

'King Henry [III.] conferred on him [Miles, son of John de Courci] the Barony of Kingsale, to hold per integram Baroniam, and confirmed all the lands of Ulster to Lacie by patent, dated 29 May, 1223, 7 of his reign.'

This date, obviously, refers to the grant of Ulster, but has been carelessly read as applying to 'the Barony of Kingsale.' There is, however, no such grant of Ulster on that date. What is the solution of the mystery? Simply that a genuine grant of 7 John (1205) has been stupidly given as of 7 Henry III. (1223). Therefore the date should be 1205, not 1223, and has, moreover, nothing to do with the Courcys or with Kingsale!

And with this imaginary date everything goes by the board. There is no evidence that Henry III. granted a 'Barony of Kingsale,' no evidence that it ever belonged to Miles de Courcy 'the first lord,' no evidence that he was the father of that Patrick de Courci who is the first of the family on record. The whole story has been patched together to connect this fatherless Patrick with John, the conqueror of Ulster.

It is not alleged that any Courcy actually sat as a peer in Parliament till 1339-1340, a date (if genuine) inferior, of course, to that of several English baronies; and, whatever the family's status was, it required, we learn from Ulster, to be 'confirmed by patent 1397.' G. E. C. assigns this confirmation to '1396-97, 20 Ric. II.,' and both writers clearly copy from Lodge's statement that the then lord, 'by the letters patent of the King, received a confirmation of the honours and titles of Baron of Kingsale and Ringrone.' But here again they get their date by misreading Lodge, who does not supply one. As the earliest patent for an Irish barony is assigned to

1462, the terms of this Courcy patent would be of extreme interest, and it is much to be regretted that Lodge did not quote them. Possibly they implied a creation de novo, and would thus have been distasteful to his patrons. In any case, so long as it is kept in retentis, a doubt will surround this document, and we hope therefore that Ulster's successor will give us the terms and the exact date either from the patent itself or from its enrolment.

But really as to dates of creation, what can be said of the extraordinary carelessness, in a matter most keenly discussed, with which Sir Bernard year after year has recorded the creation of the Barony of Segrave as 24th June, 1295, at the foot of a paragraph in which he rightly states that 'the house referred the creation of his [Lord Segrave's] Peerage to the writ of 11 Edward I.' (i.e. 1283)? The resolutions of the Committee were precisely similar as to the Mowbray and the Segrave baronies, and yet Ulster assigns them respectively to 1283 and 1295! Moreover, in Garter's Roll, which he gives, Lord Mowbray is ranked above Lord Hastings; whereas, in his own 'relative precedence,' Ulster has taken upon himself to reverse this ranking, apparently on the ground that Hastings dates from '1264,' which is indeed the date assigned to its creation at the foot of his account of that barony, although, in narrating the determination of its abeyance, he speaks of it as 'created by Edward I. in 1290.' The latter date, we may add, is the right one, as there is proof of the first lord's sitting in that year, and, though the writ is not extant, Lord Cottenham presumed, and the House accepted, its existence from the sitting. And so Sir Bernard here again contradicts himself.

Mowbray and Segrave naturally lead us to the Howard titles from which they have been severed. The guidance of Ulster King-of-Arms is here most untrustworthy. The Duke of Norfolk is Earl Marshal under a 'creation,' not of 1483, but of 1672; he is Earl of Arundel, not 'by possession of Arundel Castle only,' but under the special entail of the dignity, created by Act of Parliament in 1627, and 'the Fitzalans, Earls of Arundel,' are not 'now represented by' him; finally, he is Duke of Norfolk, whatever any one may say, under the 'creation' of 1514, not under that of 1483. Even Ulster speaks of his ancestor as 'created Duke of Norfolk' in 1514, and that creation by Henry VIII. naturally ignored the Yorkist creation of 1483, which perished with Richard III. Nor, even apart from creation, is 1483 the date of the precedence implied. Moreover, the final act of restoration (which has modified, we shall find, the limitation of the dignity) me

not

and

ase,

this

will

tent

the

sed.

tion

of a

rred

t of

ittee

rave

and

Lord

own

rerse

from

t the

the

d by

right

and,

, and

o Sir

ward

ce of

Duke

1483,

on of

f the

'the

by'

may

1483. ke of urally with date ration gnity)

was

was passed, not (as Ulster states) in '1664,' but in 1660, being confirmed in 1661. The restored Duke, by the way, was a lunatic living at Padua. As an instance of the extraordinary carelessness prevailing in these matters, we may add that Mr. Fleming, that most eminent Peerage counsel, in opening the case for Lord Stourton, asserted that this 'restoration extended by express words to all who could claim under the first Duke of Norfolk' (Proceedings on the Mowbray Peerage Claim, 30th May, 1876, p. 6), and that the Committee allowed this assertion to pass unquestioned. But the Act, as we read it, excludes the Effingham line (as they are also excluded from the dignity of Earl Marshal); so that only those who can claim under the 'fourth' Duke are now in remainder to either dignity.

The appearance of this, the last volume destined to be edited by Ulster, has afforded a fitting opportunity for discussing the improvements it yet requires. We trust that what we have said may be of service to its future editor, by enabling him to correct still further what may be fairly described as our standard work upon the Peerage. Nor is it only correction that is needed. The sense of proportion is at present wanting, some families being assigned undue space and importance relatively to others. The arrangement also is, at times, misleading; as, for instance, under Lytton, where the pedigree of the Lords Lytton commences with Sir Robert de Lytton, temp. Henry IV., though their real ancestor was William Robinson, a stranger in blood to the old Lyttons. But what we would specially press upon him is that he should follow the example set him by G. E. C. in honesty and fidelity to fact. Let him not wait till critics or rivals have compelled him to reluctantly abandon his legends one by one. Let him remember that the official position of the late Ulster King-of-Arms has invested his book, in the eyes of the public, with a quasi-official character, which lays on him a grave responsibility for the statements it contains. We hope that, as an earnest of his desire for accuracy, he will investigate the Ruthven assumption and state the facts more fairly; and if he should hesitate, from kindness of heart, between the desire to avoid offence and the wish to let the truth be known, we commend to him the words of Aristotle: - 'Αμφοῦν φιλοῦν ὄντοιν. όσιον προτιμάν την άλήθειαν.

ART. V.-1. Napoléon et Alexandre. Par Albert Vandal. Vol. I. Paris, 1891.

2. Alexandre et Napoléon. Par Serge Tatistchef. Paris, 1891.

THOSE who are conversant with the history of the continent of Europe during the reign of the First Napoleon are aware of the baldness of what is written of the relations between France and Russia from the accession of Alexander to the campaign of Moscow, and especially from the abrupt Peace of Tilsit to the Conference at Erfurt. The military history of that period is well known, and the campaign of Ulm and Austerlitz, and the battles of Jena and Auerstadt, Evlau and Friedland, and their attendant combats, have been described and criticised in a manner which leaves little to be desired; but this is not the case with the political and diplomatic history. It appears that neither M. Thiers nor his predecessors as historians, MM. Bignon and Lefebvre, had seen the whole of the private diplomatic correspondence of that important period; and indeed this ignorance is the only, though a poor excuse, for the misrepresentations of the first-named writer, and the bias of the second, who was a diplomatist under Napoleon, and wrote The minutes or drafts of the letters at his express desire. of Napoleon to Alexander, and the actual letters of Alexander to Napoleon, had disappeared from the French archives, and it was only on the application of the Third Napoleon to the Russian Government that copies were obtained of those from Napoleon to Alexander; and further than this, it was only in consequence of researches at St. Petersburg by M. Tatistchef with a view to his present volume that the discovery was made of the drafts and of some of the actual letters addressed by Alexander to Napoleon, which had either been taken during the campaign of 1812, when many are known to have been burned, or had been acquired afterwards by some irregular purchase.

Besides the letters now discovered or collected and here drawn upon, are large quotations from a series of not less valuable and even more interesting reports addressed by Savary and Caulaincourt, Tchernychef and Belachoff, to their respective masters. Napoleon, as is well known, had sufficient of—we will not say, the parvenu, but of—the arrivée in his character, to be greedy of the light gossip as well as of the more important sentiments of the legitimate Courts, and Alexander took a deep interest in the inner life, temper, and disposition of the French Emperor. The reports (rapports dialogués), especially from the Frenchmen, are copious, and the interviews

views are recorded more or less dramatically, with something

approaching to phonographic accuracy of detail.

There is also another reason for the interest and importance which attaches to these volumes. Diplomatic correspondence is usually carried on between Ministers and Secretaries of State with more or less formality and circumlocution, Sovereigns were their own Ministers, and it was by their personal feelings and decisions, far more than by the despatches between the Governments, that the relations between the two countries were influenced. This system, commenced with Paul, was continued to a far greater extent by Alexander and by Napoleon, and it may well be doubted whether modern diplomacy can show anything at all comparable to the letters now disclosed. These letters moreover, at least those from Napoleon, passed through the hands of two men selected from his personal military staff and possessing his entire confidence, one of whom, Caulaincourt, was on terms of more than intimacy, almost of

equality, with Alexander.

There are many passages in these volumes which will be read with some degree of pain both in France and Russia, but to the English reader the satisfaction will be complete. He will here see fully unveiled the position held by England in the minds of these Autocrats of the Continent. Until England should be reduced to sue for peace and her naval supremacy undermined by the destruction of her commerce, their schemes for the command of the Baltic, for the conquest of Turkey and Syria, and for the invasion of India, remained visionary. 'Wherever a cock-boat can float, there I find the English flag,' was a saying attributed to Napoleon; and England, directly or indirectly, by her ships, by her subsidies, and latterly by her armies, thwarted his ambition at every turn. The seizure of the Danish Navy-then and since made the subject of much factious criticism at home and abroad, but admitted by M. Lefebvre, who pours vials of wrath upon the manner of the act, to have been justifiable and necessary—is here shown to have been called for as a measure of precaution: the removal of an arm about to be directed against ourselves, and which might have proved fatal to our maritime supremacy if not to our existence as a great European Power. It was, in fact, a bold, perhaps an unscrupulous, but an eminently patriotic act, and a fitting reply to the now disclosed and long-suspected secret clauses of the Treaty of Tilsit.

At the opening of the nineteenth century four great military Powers predominated over the continent of Europe,—Austria, Russia, Prussia, and France. Austria had lost her grasp on Italy

ndal. 891.

inent

are ween the the Peace ry of and

and ribed ired: matic ESSOES

ole of riod; e, for ias of wrote

etters ander and it o the from

aly in stchef made d by uring been

egular

here t less d by their icient s chamore

ander sition qués), interviews

and her provinces in the Netherlands, and the Holy Roman Empire had degenerated into an empty name. Prussia, for a century a rising and aggressive and almost necessarily a selfish Power, had become vacillating in her policy, fearful of France, but hoping through France to acquire territory, even at the expense of England, on the right bank of the Lower Rhine, Russia, vast in area, and with an important seaboard on the Baltic, had long fixed a covetous eye upon the provinces of the Lower Danube, by the acquisition of which she hoped at an early day to win Constantinople; but meantime her continual friction with Turkey was a source of anxiety and expense, and although her front towards Germany was covered by her Polish acquisitions, these were at that time a source rather of weakness than of strength, from the turbulent and discontented character of the population, some of whose chiefs were much favoured by France. The whole Continent was upheaved, old dynasties were threatened, old boundaries removed, hereditary alliances broken up. Germany, composed of a great number of petty States, was divided by religious and political differences, some princes inclining to Austria, a few to Prussia, and some to France, and possessing no element of unity or power of resistance to a common foe,

Such was the condition of the Continent when Napoleon became First Consul and found himself at the head of a warlike nation, intoxicated with license under the guise of liberty, with a powerful and devoted army at his disposal, and with military and administrative talents admitted to be of the first order. His was an ambition that expanded with the means of its realization, and from the Consulate for life the step was short to Imperial power and rank, and to a position such that the existing monarchies of Europe should be forced to acknowledge

France as their equal if not their superior.

The external policy of Napoleon is tersely set forth by M. Vandal in the opening paragraph of his work: 'During his whole reign, Napoleon, in his foreign policy, pursued one invariable end: to assure, by a firm peace with England, the stability of his work, the greatness of France, and the repose of the world,'—the repose indeed being that of death. To attain this end he proposed to unite himself to one of the three other military Powers. Prussia he speedily discovered was not to be relied upon. Austria, representing and governed by the proudest aristocracy in Europe, never could be really cordial with France, whether revolutionary or imperial, but the character both of Paul and his son and successor promised easier success. Hence the overtures to Paul, and on his death to Alexander, and the close alliance from Tilsit to Erfurt with

the latter. Alexander from his position, and in some degree from his personal qualities, was to become an important factor in the destinies of the Continent. He had succeeded to the throne and the ambitions of Peter and Catherine by the assassination of his father Paul. Paul, fascinated by the personal attentions of Napoleon, had become the ally of France and had broken with England,-a step most injurious to the material interests of his subjects, and so unpopular as to be counted among the causes that led to his removal. This was followed by peace with England, and the short-lived Peace of

Amiens between that country and France.

oman

for a

elfish

ance,

t the

hine.

n the

f the

early

iction

ough

cqui-

an of

of the

ance, ened,

Ger-

vided

ining

ssess-

n foe.

oleon

arlike

with

litary

order.

of its

short

t the

ledge

h by

uring

d one

d, the

epose

three

as not

y the

ordial

t the

mised

death

with

the

To

The new Emperor had been educated by La Harpe, and had imbibed many of the revolutionary opinions of his teacher, which were scarcely in harmony with his position as an autocrat, though they always exercised a considerable influence upon his actions. To Napoleon the disposition of the young Emperor was a matter of immense importance. Would he follow in the later steps of his father, or would he accept the subsidies, encourage the commerce, and cultivate the friendship of England, and so be in accord not only with the great body of his subjects, but with his great nobles and official advisers, most of whom, led by the Empress-mother, were strong advocates for the English alliance, and as strongly opposed to revolutionary France?

Alexander had however a character of his own, but it was a character full of opposite and often inconsistent elements. He could be generous and, on points of honour, even chivalrous, and was capable of disinterested actions; but he could also be deceitful and selfish, and habitually covered distrust and deceit by repeated professions of confidence and friendship. He was ardent and enthusiastic, but wanting in perseverance. Professing strong though rather mystical religious opinions, he was by no means a blameless husband. He regarded the partition of Poland as a crime, and had thoughts of reconstituting the kingdom, with himself as its king; but he was quite ready to join in the partition of Turkey, provided he got the larger share of the spoil. Napoleon was older and had far more experience of the world, but Alexander was quite his equal in natural shrewdness and in the arts of dissimulation.

A formal letter announced to the First Consul the accession of the new Emperor and was answered by him with equal formality, but also by the mission of Duroc, his aide-de-camp, and fully in his confidence, who was received very cordially by Alexander and admitted to his intimacy. The Czar expressed himself as a warm admirer of the First Consul and of the

French

French people, and as anxious for a close alliance. He raised no objection to the occupation of Egypt, and at that time, uninfluenced by Austria, was indifferent to the expulsion of the Austrian Princes from Italy. He also recalled Kolytchef from Paris, whose anti-French opinions were well known, and replaced him by Count Markof, accompanied by a private letter from himself, but who was also hampered by instructions in which the cordiality of the Sovereign was curiously blended with the distrust of his chief Minister.

The warmth of Duroc's reception was confined to the Emperor. The high society of St. Petersburg, led by the Empress-mother, refused his visits, and the Emperor's acts were by no means so satisfactory as his words. He still continued to employ several noble emigrants, was upon excellent terms with England, and pressed strongly for some indemnity for the King of Sardinia. He also, desirous of securing the goodwill of Austria, stipulated for the restoration of Tuscany, and the dismissal from Paris of certain Polish subjects,

obnoxious to Russia.

The opening interview between the First Consul and Count Markof was not without friction. The Consul declined to renew certain engagements entered into with Paul, when the ally of France, and expressed his surprise that Alexander should interest himself in 'ce roitelet de Sardaigne.' 'Russia,' he observed, 'addressed France as though she were the Republic of Lucca,' a remark which Markof strongly resented at a subsequent meeting with Talleyrand. 'Peace first, and we can settle the points in dispute afterwards,' said the Consul. Markof, on the other hand, thought the settlement of the questions should form a part of the Treaty of Peace. The Consul also, referring to Sardinia's claims on Alexander, ridiculed the admission of sentiment or gratitude into public affairs, and expressed his intention of annexing Piedmont to France as irrevocable. A treaty of peace was, however, agreed upon towards the close of 1801, with provisions in it which it is clear that both parties intended to and did evade. Markof was fully accredited as Minister Plenipotentiary, and Caulaincourt relieved Duroc at St. Petersburg. Caulaincourt was a man of family and polished manners; and though not then very cordially received by Russian society, at that time exercising a strong influence upon the Government, he made some way in it. His stay, however, on this occasion, was limited to six months.

Markof, at Paris, turned out to be insensible to the special attentions of the First Consul, to whom, from his coldness and

reticence

reticence and his English predilections, he became intensely distasteful. At a public reception, while discussing the employment of French emigrants by Russia, the Consul, either really or intentionally, lost his temper, and so behaved that Markof declined to appear at the Consular levees until he had received fresh instructions from his Court. His conduct was approved, and to mark publicly the approval he received the cross of St. Andrew. Napoleon complained that, although he had tolerated him, the war with England made his presence undesirable, and requested his recall. Alexander personally resented the affront to his representative. On some public occasion seeing the French Envoy holding back, he said, 'Pourquoi ne vous approchez-vous pas, M. Hédouville? je ne vous ferai pas de scène comme celle que le Premier Consul a fait a mon Ministre a Paris; and in a letter sent by post, that it might be read by the French Government, the Chancellor writes, 'Que l'Empereur Alexandre avait été étonné et choqué de l'esclandre fait aux Tuileries à son Ministre,' adding that the Consul's behaviour was 'semblable à celle d'un grénadier qui aurait fait fortune, plutôt qu'à l'attitude du Chef d'une grande nation.' Markof, it seems, had shown contempt for the Minister for Foreign Affairs as 'an defroqué,' an unfrocked priest, and the Consul had spoken of 'ce polisson Markof,' so it was high time he should take leave, which he did in person,

of the mission was, however, not as yet withdrawn. Though Alexander's words were as smooth as ever and nearly as cordial, his opinion of Napoleon had undergone, for the first though by no means for the last time, a complete revolution, promoted no doubt by La Harpe. The Consul was no longer in his eyes 'a young hero, a vigilant guardian of the public liberties.' He now appeared as 'ambitious, unscrupulous, seeking to conquer supreme power.' 'He is,' wrote Alexander to La Harpe, 'one of the most famous tyrants recorded in

in an ironical speech, with his cross upon his breast. The staff

history.'

raised

time.

on of

ytchef

and

rivate

ctions

ended

o the

y the

s acts

l con-

cellent

mnity

g the

scany,

bjects,

Count

ed to en the

cander

ussia,

e the

sented

t, and

onsul.

of the

ander,

public

ont to

wever,

in it

evade.

y, and

ncourt

ch not

t time

made

, was

special

ss and

ticence

The

This was not war, but it was very near it, and was brought still nearer by the abduction and execution of the Duc d'Enghien,-an act characterized by Alexander as 'une violation aussi gratuite que manifeste du droit de gens,'-and for whom the Russian Court wore mourning. Oubril, the head of the diplomatic staff at Paris, was directed to call upon the French Government to fulfil the provisions of the Treaty by withdrawing their troops from Hanover, Naples, and the North of Germany, and indemnifying the King of Sardinia for his losses. This demand was probably rendered more imperative by a

letter in which Talleyrand somewhat indecently, but in keen and polished phraseology, alluded to the death of Paul, and gave thereby great offence to Alexander. The result was the final withdrawal of Oubril and his staff from France, which was followed closely by the assumption by Napoleon of the Imperial

title, and shortly afterwards of the crown of Italy.

To meet these indications of an alarming and unscrupulous aggression, Alexander, encouraged by the return to power of Mr. Pitt, proposed to form a general coalition. What were known as 'French principles' were popular in Europe so long as they were applied to the overthrow of the feudal system, and to the establishment of political liberty; but now that France was herself submitting to and seeking to impose upon other nations the far worse tyranny of a military despotism, it behaved those nations to unite for the protection of all. The manifesto prepared towards the close of 1804 under the eye of Alexander, upon whom the experiences of the Emperor Joseph II. were clearly wasted, was sent to his Envoy in London, and must have rather astonished the English Minister. It proposed a scheme largely tinged with universal philanthropy. France was to be appealed to, to resume her national freedom. The sacred rights of humanity were to be established. Governments were to consider the welfare of their people, and the people to be imbued with a spirit of wisdom and benevolence. Neutrality was to be respected, and no State forced into war. The boundaries of nations were to be the features fixed by nature, seas and rivers left free for commerce. and nations to be in harmony according to what is called their 'natural equilibrium.' Monarchy, but of a constitutional character, would seem to be recommended. For such a system of what Napoleon contemptuously called 'ideology,' Europe was certainly not prepared, and such principles were likely to be regarded with especial suspicion, when advocated by the successor of Peter the Great and the Empress Catherine, the ruler of the most trodden-down peasantry in Europe, and an autocrat who was well known to aspire to the conquest and partition of Turkey. The danger, however, was real and pressing, and what is known as the Third Coalition was speedily formed, at first by the union of England and Sweden with Russia, and shortly afterwards with Austria, although she had acknowledged the new Emperor.

There was, however, much in a character composed of such opposite ingredients as that of Alexander, which if handled skilfully might, in the opinion of Napoleon, and in his hands, be turned to the advantage of France. Talleyrand, whose advice.

advice, even when not followed, was never without its weight, always inclined to the union with Austria, and thought that by assisting her to acquisitions on the Lower Danube she would act as a barrier to the expansion eastward of Russia, and help to confine that dangerous and increasing Power within moderate boundaries. Napoleon, on the other hand, contemplated. sooner or later, a close union with Russia, and considered that, by promoting her well-known views on Turkey, he was rendering her less dangerous in Europe, and planting a formidable thorn in the side of England. He therefore put up with much from Russia that he certainly would not have tolerated from any other Power; nevertheless, as the way to such a union as he contemplated lay only through a decisive victory or victories. Napoleon kept himself well informed as to the new Coalition, and was prepared, not unwillingly, to accept the challenge, without Prussia as an ally, or it might be with her as an enemy. Prussia, too near to quarrel with Russia, and having too much to hope for to break with France, had half accepted from that Power the bribe of Hanover, and, distrusted by all parties, had decided to maintain an armed neutrality of the German States. Wirtemberg and Baden, and, with many searchings of heart, Bavaria, sided with France.

Austria, called 'the Faubourg St. Germain of Europe,' as strongly opposed to Imperial as to revolutionary France, placed in the centre of the league, at once took action, and invaded Bavaria, without waiting for the Russian forces, which were delayed on account of the refusal of Prussia to allow them to traverse her neutral territory. Napoleon, who had recently made a great display of his 'Army of England' at Boulogne, at once laid aside, if ever he had really contemplated, the invasion of England; broke up his camp; and opened a campaign as brief as it was brilliant, which remains a masterpiece of the art of war. One hundred and ninety thousand men, dispersed over all parts of the Continent, were at once put in motion, and in seven divisions, led by his most celebrated Marshals, were concentrated upon the Upper Danube. By exertions hitherto unheard of, he completed the movements before Russia had time to unite with Austria; burst with the suddenness and force of a thunderbolt upon Ulm, and with the city captured 30,000 Austrians, 60 cannons, and 40 standards, with Mack, their general; fought the battle of Austerlitz, crushed Austria, allowed the vanquished Russians to return unmolested to their own country, and entered Vienna, all within the space of three months. It was thus that Napoleon covered his abandonment of the invasion of England, and almost balanced the defeat of Trafalgar.

handled is hands, whose advice,

keen

, and

s the

was

perial

nlons

ver of

were

o long

n, and

rance

other

sm, it

ne eve

nperor

vov in

nister.

ohilan-

ational

estab-

f their

wisdom

o State

be the

merce,

ed their

utional

system

Europe

ikely to

by the

ine, the

and an

est and

eal and

speedily

en with

she had

of such

The

Trafalgar. His career as First Consul opened with the passage of the Alps and the victory of Marengo; that of the Emperor reached its zenith with the surrender of Ulm and the victory of Austerlitz.

When Napoleon commenced the campaign, he trusted by a brilliant victory to dissolve the Coalition and form a close alliance with Russia. But this was not yet to be. Russia, though beaten, was still a formidable Power, and the Prussian army, considerable and well-disciplined, was by an untoward

event thrown into alliance with Russia.

Bernadotte, in his anxiety to anticipate the arrival of the Russian force at Ulm, had traversed Anspach, and thus violated the neutrality of Prussia, which Alexander had scrupulously respected. This was to treat her as a petty State of small account, and was a stain upon her military honour at which the The king, timid and whole nation took violent offence. irresolute, could no longer restrain his people. Duroc, who was sent to offer a somewhat lame apology, found Alexander at Berlin, and the discovery that during a recent negociation France had offered Hanover to England touched the self-seeking policy of Prussia on a vital point. Alexander was not indisposed to figure as the protector of the King and Queen of Prussia, and, trusting to his support, Frederick refused the overtures of Napoleon and prepared for war. This alliance was entirely due to Alexander's personal feelings and contrary to the advice of his Council, who thought Prussia, if successful, might become a very dangerous neighbour. England also regarded Prussia as likely in that event to prove as ambitious as Napoleon himself. Nevertheless, Alexander accepted the Prussian alliance, and the two monarchs swore fidelity over the ashes of the great Frederick.

Both had indeed ample cause for alarm. The Confederation of the Rhine had taken the place of the Holy Roman Empire, and included Bavaria, Wirtemberg, Baden, and thirteen smaller principalities, with Napoleon as its protector; thus creating a strong anti-Prussian power, and securing for France a ready entrance into the heart of the Prussian dominions. Alexander also saw in the new Grand Duchy of Warsaw a strong incitement to a Polish rising, with a prospect of the resurrection of that kingdom. Great inducements were held out to Austria by both France and Russia to take an active part. France offered her Silesia, the province beloved of Maria Theresa, in exchange for Galicia, and afterwards absolutely, and Russia sent Pozzo di Borgo, the personal enemy of Napoleon, to advocate her views. But Austria, bleeding at every pore, though her wishes

sage

eror y of

by a

close ssia.

sian

ward

f the

lated

ously

small

h the

o was

er at

rance

oolicy sed to

, and,

es of

tirely

dvice

ecome

sia as

mself.

e, and

great

ration

mpire,

ting a

ready

xander

incite-

tion of

tria by

offered

change

Pozzo

te her

wishes

were

were with Russia, could not afford to declare herself. Deprived of Italy, Tyrol, and Suabia, she had yet too much to lose to tempt at present the fortune of war, and it was only after considerable pressure that she privately promised aid in the event of any considerable success. The time had not yet arrived contemplated by the Archduke Charles when on breaking up his force he told the soldiers, 'Reposez-vous, jusqu'à ce que nous récommencions.' Napoleon then and afterwards was well aware that, should he be worsted in Spain, the neutrality of Austria would be exchanged for an attack upon his rear.

Napoleon, true to his policy of driving Russia into a close alliance, had not withdrawn his troops into France. 'I have,' he wrote to his brother Jerome, '150,000 men, and with them I can secure the submission of Vienna, Berlin, and St. Petersburg.' Nor was this a vain boast. When Prussia, without waiting for her support of Russia, invaded and coerced Saxony and Hesse-Cassel, Napoleon crossed the Rhine at Mayence, drove back the Prussians, and within three weeks had won the battles of Jena and Auerstadt, fixed his head-quarters at Potsdam, and placed Davoust in Berlin. This was speedily followed by the capture of Magdeburg and the reduction of the Silesian fortresses. But the Russians still kept the field, and Prussia, though broken, still refused the offered terms. Napoleon therefore found it absolutely necessary to winter in the North, and to prepare for a struggle in which the elements at least would be against him. From Berlin he issued the famous decrees which subject Europe was ordered to obey, and by which he trusted to strike a deadly blow at the naval supremacy of England.

Prussia had made no provision for a defeat. Her fortresses, though garrisoned, were ill-commanded and unprepared for serious resistance. Passion and sentiment had dictated the war, in which prudence and foresight had no part. territory was reduced to a fragment, her army to a mere residue. The work of two centuries, the acquisitions of the great Frederick, were swept away, and Prussia was about to be erased from the roll of the nations of Europe. Napoleon placed the conquered provinces under the French fiscal system, and when he employed native officers required from them an oath of fidelity to the new Government. He thus laid hands on the whole resources of the country, which were considerable, appears that when Napoleon entered on the campaign he brought with him but twenty-four thousand francs in gold; when the French retired from these provinces in 1809, 200,000 men had been quartered upon them for two years, and this in addition to

Vol. 177.—No. 354. 2 F large

large sums of money paid into the French Treasury. Napoleon, always untouched by female influence, attributed the persistence in the war, not unjustly, to the Queen of Prussia, whom he classed with Marie Antoinette and the Queen of Naples as women who had ruined their husbands. Turning to the Turkish Ambassador, he said, smiling, 'You are wise, you

Turks, to shut them up.'

Prussia had hitherto been a principal in the war, but now that her territory was reduced to a small province, her position as regarded Russia was reversed. At Ulm and Jena, Russia had not put in an appearance, and she had played but a secondary part at Austerlitz. She was now to meet Napoleon face to face, and was threatened not only with defeat but with invasion. Both parties exerted themselves to the utmost. Alexander brought all the resources of his Empire to the front, and preached a crusade through his dominions against 'the enemy of mankind.' Napoleon brought up reinforcements from France, raised a considerable body of Poles, secured Saxony as an ally, and induced Turkey to take the field, drawing off a considerable Russian diversion.

The rejection of an armistice by Prussia on the plea that she could not act independently of Russia, made it probable that the contest would be continued into another year, through the winter, which the Russians thought would give an advantage to their troops, seasoned to the climate, and much nearer to their Thus compelled, Napoleon moved to Posen, where resources. he was received with great enthusiasm, scarcely however encouraged by the vague and cautious manner in which he alluded to the resurrection of the Polish kingdom. Open encouragement would put an end to the neutrality of Austria, which at that conjuncture might have been fatal; as it was, Austria complained, and it was to meet this that Napoleon offered her Silesia, in exchange for Galicia, the Austrian share of Poland. Polish Prussia as part of the new Grand Duchy of Warsaw was treated with great financial forbearance, and placed under a provisional government of native citizens.

Towards the close of 1806 Napoleon, after some severe fighting, established his quarters at Warsaw, having the Vistula, and beyond it the Russian army, in his front, with a strongly entrenched camp at Pultusk. The French forces, including Saxons, other Germans, and Poles, numbered about 160,000 men; the Russians, with the Prussian contribution, about 120,000 to 130,000. The Russians, extended from Pultusk to Königsberg, were sharply engaged in a series of combats, including the severe battle of Pultusk, until the end of January, when

Napoleon

n he s as the you now ition ussia adary ce to asion. ander ached ny of rance, ally, erable

leon,

ence

at she
e that
gh the
tage to
o their
where
encoualluded
buragehich at
Austria
red her
Poland.
aw was
under a

severe Vistula, strongly cluding 160,000 120,000 igsberg, ing the 7, when Japoleon

Napoleon broke up his brief winter-quarters, again took the field, and met the enemy at Eylau, where the Prussian troops greatly distinguished themselves, and the losses, especially heavy, were nearly equal on both sides, while to the French such a victory was felt as a defeat, so great was the discouragement. Above a thousand miles from home, amid the privations of a Northern winter, discontent pervaded the whole army from the Marshals down to the latest recruit. All cried for peace, but it was admitted that this could only be brought about by a signal victory, which Alexander still hoped to gain. Eylau was so balanced that Alexander claimed it as a victory, and invited Austria to declare herself. 'Win two such victories and Austria will join you,' was the necessarily cautious answer. The exhaustion was in truth complete on either side, and Napoleon moved into and remained in his new winter-quarters at Osterode and Finkestein for many months, during which Dantzig was taken, and his Lieutenants achieved several less important successes on the Bugg and the Narew. The pause gave more employment to the pen than the sword. Terms were again offered to Prussia and again declined, and negociations of a sufficiently complex character-'négociations réelles ou simulacres de négociation'-were entered upon with Austria and Turkey. But the alliance so coveted by the Emperor was not yet attained. In the month of June, with an army refreshed and recruited, he again took the field, and fought and won the decisive battle of Friedland, when standards, cannon, magazines, and the whole spoils of war fell into his hands, and with them the stronghold of Königsberg.

The last card was played. Prussia was annihilated, and Russia, beaten on her own threshold, was threatened with an invasion of her territory. Even then Alexander, who had declined overtures of remarkable friendliness after Austerlitz, was unwilling to ask for peace, and it was only when made aware of the utter impossibility of continuing the war that he humbled himself so far as to agree to indirect proposals for an

armistice.

But Alexander could not be more desirous of relief than was Napoleon willing to concede it. The ruin of England seemed now almost within his reach, and on his part nothing should be wanting to secure it. The Russian Envoy was received as representing an equal and not a vanquished enemy, with all the forms of deference and respect, and in more important matters in a tone of extreme moderation. An immediate personal interview was proposed and accepted, and Alexander, who had hitherto refused to recognize the French

Emperor, now silently so addressed him. Preliminaries so promising and so unlooked-for at once captivated the impulsive character of the Czar, and contrasted with what he chose to regard as the desertion of Austria and the parsimony of England. He is reputed, as he stepped upon the raft at Tilsit, to have said, 'Je haïs les Anglais autant que vous les haïssez,' to which came the ready and far more sincere response, 'En ce

cas tout peut s'arranger, et la paix est faite.'

Such was the greeting between the two potentates who were met to reduce the Continent of Europe to two empires; to compel by force all dissentients to join them; to combine for the pillage of Turkey; and to drive from the seas of Europe and the peninsula of Hindostan the only Power that possessed a constitutional government, or whose subjects enjoyed personal or any measure of political liberty. As Alexander expressed it, 'La France et la Russie s'entendant, le reste du monde sera ce que nous voudrons qu'il soit.' England might justly be proud of their proscription, and proud also of this recognition of her position in the forefront of the cause of national

independence. The Conference of Tilsit is an epoch in modern history and carries a warning not to be neglected with impunity. Never, in the history of the civilized world, had two men met with powers so great, and never have great powers been exercised with so little regard for the public good, or with a greater measure of sordid self-interest. The new arrangement of the nations of the Continent according to the will of France, and with the consent of Russia, all were to be compelled to recognize; Austria was beaten down, Prussia broken, the German Empire had given place to the French Confederation of the Rhine. the Princes of Germany had become mere vassals of France; Spain, Naples, Holland, the new Grand Duchy of Berg, and the kingdom of Westphalia, had received, or were about to receive, kings of the family of Napoleon, and Poland was sufficiently encouraged to become dangerous to her own peace and that of her neighbours, without any real prospect of regaining her old and, it must be confessed, always ill-managed independence. Napoleon-for Alexander at that time was but a puppet in his hand-was the Cæsar of modern Europe, with powers greater and more extensive than had been wielded even by Charles the Great, or in ancient days by 'Macedonia's madman' or the monarchs of Tartary or the Euphrates.

But great as he stood in the plenitude of his power, Napoleon was beset with difficulties which might, and in fact did, contain the germ of his destruction. To overcome Russia he

had evoked forces which even he was unable to control. To convert the Grand Duchy of Warsaw into the Polish kingdom was to alienate Russia and to force Austria to wage a perpetual war. He had to persuade these Powers that the resurrection of Poland was a mere chimera, which he did not and never had intended to realize. From an early period he had asserted that it was the interest of France to support Turkey, and under his directions she had been incited to go to war with Russia. He had now to assure Alexander that his engagements were personal with the late Sultan, and never with the Porte, and he had to propose to him the conquest and partition of her European dominions, Greece and Constantinople included, and the securing a road through Persia by which to invade the

possessions of England in Hindostan.

Alexander, dazzled by the prospects unfolded to him, at first believed in their speedy accomplishment, but the time came when he saw that the whole was a mere lure, to divert his attention from matters nearer home, and that Napoleon, at any rate of late years, did not seriously contemplate such an expedition. The attentions of Napoleon to Alexander during the nine days' interview were excessive, and have frequently been described and with great minuteness; but the Czar, with all his abandon, was not wanting in statecraft or powers of dissimulation. At first, though carried away by the brilliancy and intellectual power of his host, and greatly struck by the multitude of topics upon which, with evident intention, he unfolded his experience, when removed from the wand of the enchanter he became aware that while Napoleon gained much he gave little. Thus, while conceding territory to Prussia as a favour to Alexander, he quietly made the actual evacuation of the country conditional upon the payment of a sum quite beyond the power of so impoverished a State to provide. Thus also, while protesting his innocence of any designs connected with the Grand Duchy of Warsaw, he severed it permanently from Prussia, and under the shadow of Saxony retained it beneath the protection of France; and finally, when some time afterwards the particulars of the partition of Turkey came to be discussed it appeared that while Russia was to be allowed to acquire Constantinople, France was to hold the key of the Dardanelles and the command of the southern shore, without which to retain the city would be impracticable.

The conversations between the Sovereigns were frequent, long continued, and embraced a great variety of topics. When notes were to be taken in the absence of a third person, 'I,' said Napoleon, 'will be your secretary, you shall be mine;' and

non

Napoact did, ussia he had

S 80

lsive

se to

y of ilsit,

ssez,

En ce

were

; to

e for

urope

essed

sonal

ressed

e sera

ly be

ogni-

tional

y and

Never,

t with

rcised

reater

of the

e, and

recog-

erman

Rhine,

rance;

rg, and

out to

id was

peace

pect of

anaged

vas but

e, with

ed even

edonia's

upon such notes the actual treaties were framed. But much, probably the most important conversations, were not set down in writing, and are only known because afterwards Alexander continually referred to what was promised at Tilsit, and seldom failed tacitly to reproach Napoleon by asserting that on his own

part all his promises had been fulfilled.

The Treaty finally agreed upon contained many secret provisions, especially one to coerce all nations to enforce the Berlin decrees. This applied particularly to Sweden and Denmark, by the aid of whose fleets Napoleon intended to close the Baltic and form the nucleus of a naval force sufficient to keep the sea against England. For the King of Prussia, Napoleon had a strong personal antipathy. He was only admitted at the instance of Russia, and Napoleon refused to treat with him personally. When the treaty with Prussia had been approved by Napoleon, it was presented to the king, not for discussion,

but for signature.

After nine days of close intimacy and an interchange of military civilities, the Sovereigns separated with many professions of personal and political friendship, and close unity of action. At St. Petersburg Alexander found the English Ambassador and Sir Robert Wilson, whom he admitted to his intimacy, and to whom he expressed sentiments with regard to England the very reverse of what he had made a boast of at Tilsit, and which at that very time he was repeating to Savary, the French Envoy at his Court. It remains uncertain whether this conduct, which far exceeds the license supposed to be accorded to diplomacy, expressed his real unwillingness to break with England, or whether it was intended to close the eyes of England until the time came to carry the decisions of Tilsit into action. While these deceptions were being carried on, Talleyrand wrote from Paris, 'Le Dannemark ne pourroit rester passif, et il faudra bien qu'il se décide pour ou contre l'Angleterre.

The fleet of Denmark was composed of twenty sail of the line, sixteen frigates, nine brigs of war, and some smaller vessels, manned with excellent sailors, and ready to put to sea. On its possession turned the whole plan of Napoleon for the closure of the Baltic and the formation of such a fleet as might hold the sea against the English. Of this the English Ministers were aware, but they did not know what long afterwards came to light, that the Prince Regent of Denmark was actually in treaty with the French, and was on the point of going over to them with the fleet. At this juncture England stepped in. She dispatched to the Baltic a sufficient force to justify the

Danes

much, down xander seldom is own

provi-Berlin mark, se the beep poleon ted at th him proved ussion,

nge of y pronity of h Amto his regard t of at Savary, thether to be neess to ose the ions of carried ourroit

of the smaller to sea. for the might nisters a came ally in over to sed in. ify the Danes

Danes in a peaceable surrender of their fleet, which, however, their engagement with France forbade, and in the event of their compliance England offered herself to undertake their defence. Denmark having refused, Copenhagen was attacked and the fleet carried off. No doubt the proceeding was high-handed, but it was absolutely necessary and conducted with every attempt to avoid violence. The Ministers who so acted deserved well of their country; how well may be inferred from the violent anger of Napoleon and the abuse and misrepresentations of his followers. Had there existed any doubt as to the stern necessity for the act, the later knowledge of the particulars of the secret Treaty must have dispelled them.

Napoleon was represented at St. Petersburg by Savary, which fact obliged Alexander, somewhat unwillingly, to enforce the Berlin decrees, very much against the material interests of his people. Austria, though with a limited seaboard, was the channel of a great flow of English wares into South Germany, and she also, not being ready for war, was compelled to enforce the decrees, some concession of territory being made as a salve to her honour. The answer to this attack on Denmark was the well-known extension of the Berlin decrees, proclaimed from Milan. There was a general confiscation of English goods, and large fortunes were secretly made by the sale of licenses and by the

general encouragement of smuggling.

Savary, whose mission was to see to the enforcement of the Continental System, was not popular in St. Petersburg, and much was made of his having been an actor in the D'Enghien tragedy. He was replaced by Caulaincourt, who, though not entirely free from that stain, was a man of a different class, who made his way with the Empress-mother and the high Russian society, and was admitted to great intimacy with the Emperor. Tolstoi, accredited to the Tuileries, was selected as likely to be personally agreeable to Napoleon. Being a rough soldier, he was expected not to mix in the society of the Faubourg, where the Imperial Government was pretty freely discussed. fortunately for his mission, he showed himself a Russian of the old school-cold, dry, and reticent, deaf to all the advances of Napoleon, imbued with great distrust of France, whether revolutionary, consular, or imperial, not indisposed to take the part of England, and somewhat ashamed of the adulation of Napoleon and of the overflowing praise of everything French by his Sovereign. The letters of Savary had led the French Government to suppose that Alexander, entirely occupied with the prospect of acquisitions in Turkey, would be indifferent to what passed nearer home. This was altogether a mistake, brought about probably by Alexander's excessive praise of Napoleon, and the confidence he was never tired of repeating, that the Emperor would fulfil his promises at Tilsit. The instructions given to Tolstoi, mainly drawn up by Alexander himself, were voluminous. He was to keep alive the intimacy established at Tilsit, to press for the present evacuation of the Prussian States, and to insist upon the retention by Russia of the Danubian Principalities. If he saw his way, he was to acquire Bessarabia and the eastern or Circassian shore of the Black Sea, from the Kouban River to the fortress of Poti. This was pretty well from a Prince who was always protesting his disinterestedness, and nowhere more strongly than in these very instructions. Alexander, indeed, half apologetically admitted to Savary that it was the custom with Russia, derived from the wars of Catherine and Potemkin, to hold what she had conquered, somewhat after the practice of Asiatics. The two main points insisted on in the instructions were the evacuation of the Prussian States and the retention of the Danubian Principalities, the two to be treated as totally distinct questions, whereas Napoleon insisted on connecting the two, and would not hear of the first unless considered with the second. The dispute at the last took a personal aspect, for Alexander rested on promises made verbally at Tilsit, which Napoleon, when hard pressed, went so far as to designate as 'quelques discours mal saisis, mal retenus, ou mal interprétés.'

Tolstoi proved a most unaccommodating negociator. Napoleon had purchased Murat's Grand Hotel, with all its contents, as a residence for the Russian Embassy; but Tolstoi declined entering it without the special permission of his Court. At his first interview with the Foreign Minister he expressed his surprise that the Prussian States were not already evacuated; and he repeated his remonstrance to the Emperor, who at first said that troops could not be so quickly moved, and ended by declaring that he held them as against the Russian occupation of the Danubian Provinces. After an unusually long and rather warm discussion, Napoleon would only consent to one of three conditions—(1) Russia to retire from the Provinces and France from the Prussian States; (2) Russia to continue to hold the Provinces, and France the States; (3) general partition of the Turkish Empire, Russia to have Constantinople, subject to certain qualifications to be settled with France. Tolstoi promised to refer these alternatives to his Court, but added that what was wanted was the fulfilment of the promise made at Tilsit. In reply to an enquiry as to the existence of an anti-French party at St. Petersburg, he admitted it to some

extent,

extent, and in rather a minatory tone warned his Majesty that Russia was by no means at the end of her resources, and that the voluntary gifts of the nobles would enable her to dispense

with the aid of foreign subsidies.

se of

ting,

struc-

mself, ished

tates,

ubian

rabia

a the

well

lness,

tions.

hat it

erine

after in the

d the

eated

d on

con-

ly at

as to

ı mal

Napo-

tents,

clined

ated; t first

ed by

and

ne of

s and

ue to parti-

nople,

rance.

t, but

omise

some

extent,

. At

The discussions between Alexander and Caulaincourt, if carried on with more courtesy, and with a politeness on the part of the Sovereign that savoured of insincerity, scarcely tended to a nearer approximation. Caulaincourt, who, though unfettered as to the mode of acting on Alexander, was allowed no discretion as to the objects to be attained, had opinions of his own, which he expressed clearly but cautiously in his letters, and to which it had been well for Napoleon had he paid more atten-For Caulaincourt had a full appreciation of the difficulties under which Alexander acted. The acquisition of Finland, at which the French had assisted, had produced a favourable effect, but in public opinion enough had not been gained to justify the French alliance, or to balance the loss of the material advantages of the commerce with England; and Alexander was well aware that public dissatisfaction, carried beyond a certain point, had cost his father his throne and his life. Hence his determination to hold the Danubian Provinces, and his desire for a large share in the spoils of the Turkish kingdom. As regarded Prussia, Alexander considered himself bound in honour to insist upon the restitution of her States; a chivalrous feeling, no doubt, but not a little strengthened by the fact that Russia could not afford to have a kingdom created by or under the influence of France established upon her frontier, and consequently any counterpoise for her retention of the Danubian Provinces must not be at the expense of Prussia. There was also the belief that Napoleon was not unlikely to make the Grand Duchy of Warsaw a centre for the resuscitation of the Polish kingdom, and to include within it Silesia. As to relinquishing the Provinces without compensation, that would be giving up all Alexander had to show to justify the French alliance, which much needed justification. An attack on Turkey would certainly bring England and Austria into the field, and Alexander now saw that it had been brought forward to divert his attention from Europe, and that Napoleon had never seriously contemplated it.

Out of materials so unpromising, fair words and frequent professions of friendship were not likely to produce an accord; nor did they. 'Rien ne presse de la changer,' said Napoleon, in private; and Caulaincourt was directed, so far as he could safely, to employ all his skill in raising delays, the result of which was that Alexander felt himself to be duped, and declared in despair that he had given up all thoughts of Turkey; a conclusion strengthened by the advice of Czartoryski and Pozzo di Borgo, and by the reports of Tolstoi, who, already disliked by Napoleon, had been indulging in a flirtation with Madame Récamier, always out of favour with the Imperial Court. Matters seemed at a deadlock. 'Mêmes questions, mêmes réponses,' as Napoleon expressed it. From the side of Turkey also difficulties arose. Sebastiani, ambassador there, had guaranteed to the Turk the integrity of his empire, and now was called upon to propose the cession of the Danubian Provinces to Russia, on which the Sultan threatened war, the consequence of which, the Ambassador thought, would be a Russian victory, and the taking of Constantinople without any aid from France. It was upon this that Napoleon, seriously alarmed, without consulting Alexander, presumed upon the alliance so far as to assure the Turk that the armistice agreed upon at Tilsit would be maintained, and thus tied the hands of his ally, and this at a time when Alexander was displeased at having to attack Sweden without the promised French aid, and when he was carrying his courtesy to Napoleon so far as to forbid to the French emigrants at St. Petersburg the use of the

white cockade or the display of the fleur de lis. The aspect of affairs was indeed serious and complicated. Spain was in insurrection and Austria fast recovering her military strength, so that a rupture with Russia would involve the break-up of the whole of the Continental system. Napoleon, whose versatility was never more remarkably displayed than in his foreign relations, at once decided to shift his ground, and, in appearance at least, to convert endless negociations into a promise of prompt action. Early in 1808 he wrote a long and well-considered letter to Alexander, proposing to him what was in fact half of the empire of the civilized world. 'I will,' he said, 'aid you to take Sweden, and agree to any extension of your empire in that direction. We will provide-Austria, if you will, joining us to some limited extent—a force of 60,000 or 70,000 men. France has already troops in Dalmatia, as has Russia on the Danube; all might be ready by the 15th of March, and by the 1st of May the allied army would be on the Bosphorus, on its way to the Euphrates, and Russia be in possession of Stockholm. England, expelled from the Levant, and alarmed for India, would be forced to make peace.' This was the aspect presented to Alexander, but Napoleon well knew the undertaking was not of so simple a character. It may be that for the moment he was in earnest, and certainly he called for reports upon the countries to be invaded, and even settled

the lines of march for the troops, and other matters of detail. Metternich was alarmed at the news, and was anxious the expedition should be adjourned. 'Ne dites pas ajournée,' said Talleyrand, sharply; 'je vous dis, tout au plus moins imminente.'

But whatever Napoleon may really have intended, the proposal was well calculated to awaken the jaded ambition of the Czar. He at once accepted the plan, was silent as to Silesia, and sat down with Caulaincourt and his Foreign Minister Roumantzof to arrange the sharing of the spoils. The Minister, however, was less impressionable than his Sovereign: he refused, even for Turkey, to set aside Silesia, though willing to leave that question, as he might safely do, to be settled by Tolstoi. He assented to a meeting between the Sovereigns; though fearing, as it proved needlessly, the personal ascendency of Napoleon, he stipulated that certain bases of action should first be agreed upon. When these came to be discussed, difficulties arose of far too complex and serious a character to be easily settled. Napoleon asserted his whole object to be the advantage of Russia, while Alexander was of opinion that he wanted the lion's share for France. Russia insisted upon having Constantinople, but in conceding that point Napoleon still claimed to hold the key of the Dardanelles, and Syria up to their Asiatic shore,—conditions fatal to the holding of the city. Russia, Napoleon thought, would be a more dangerous neighbour than the Turk. To Metternich he said, 'It is not yet a question of partition: if it were, Austria would be needed as a counterpoise.' With these views and the state of Spain as more than an excuse, it is not surprising that the meeting was more than once deferred, to the great dissatisfaction of Alexander. The negociations, however, proceeded. Caulaincourt was the more supple negociator, but Roumantzof presented a dogged obstinacy which nothing could move, and in which he was supported by his master. The discussions and bargainings are amusing, and the common distrust is ill concealed by the repeated professions of disinterested friendship by the two Sovereigns. A careful study of the Conference, map in hand, would be an excellent lesson on the geography of Turkey in Europe. The Ministers were not a whit more advanced at the fifth than at the first meeting, and Caulaincourt could only express his regret that Roumantzof was not more conciliatory upon small than upon great points. Nor was much gained by appealing from the Minister to the Sovereign. Alexander was more smooth, more abounding in civil speeches, but beneath the varnish he was just as firm as his Minister. Caulaincourt in closing the discussion pointed out to Napoleon that the real stumbling-

ey; a i and lready with perial stions, ide of there,

e, and aubian ar, the be a at any iously on the

agreed nds of sed at d, and as to

of the

icated.

Ig her
nvolve
soleon,
han in
l, and,
into a
ig and
what
will,

ension cria, if 000 or as has 5th of on the

be in evant,
This knew

called settled the stumbling-block was Silesia; and as regarded Turkey, the key of the Dardanelles: and that whatever might be the personal disposition of Alexander, he could not long venture to continue the alliance without having some obvious and considerable advantage to show to his people. The interview was finally arranged for the 27th September at Erfurt, and without any

previous basis having been agreed upon.

Napoleon prepared for the meeting by the collection of all available information on the subject of the East, and the belief that the expedition was really contemplated created great uneasiness in England and Austria, as was intended. But the defeat of the French at Baylen, and the consequent general rising throughout the Peninsula altered materially the position of Napoleon. Austria, her military arrangements being far advanced, assumed a bolder tone. The demand for a large increase of force in Spain was imperative, and to meet this it became necessary to draw the troops from Silesia and Warsaw, and to postpone, though this was not admitted, the Turkish expedition. Napoleon announced, as a favour, the intended withdrawal of the troops, which however he pointed out would only be possible if Alexander joined him in such a declaration as should prevent an attack on the part of Austria. The announcement as to Prussia was received by Alexander with a strong expression of satisfaction; but when he found that the concession was rendered necessary by the state of Spain, although his language remained unchanged, his gratitude was much abated. And this still further when he learned that Prussia was to bear the weight of an impossible impost, until the payment of which she was to be debarred from forming an army of more than 40,000 men, and in the event of a war with Austria was to be bound to support France with 14,000. Frederick, advised by Alexander, signed the treaty to that effect, though himself of the opinion that it would be better to throw in his lot with Austria in the war which seemed impending. Alexander, while advising strongly against such a course, expressed himself warmly to Caulaincourt on the harshness of the conditions, and on his way to Erfurt paid a public visit to Frederick and the Queen at Königsberg. Unfortunately at this conjuncture a letter from Stein, Frederick's well-known Minister, encouraging a union for throwing off the yoke of France, fell into Napoleon's hands and was shown to Alexander on his arrival at Erfurt, and of course added to the difficulties of his intercession on behalf of Prussia.

The meeting at Erfurt took place as agreed upon, and lasted eighteen days. The 'parterre' of Kings and the subservience of

key

sonal

tinue

rable

nally

any

of all

belief

great

it the

neral

sition

g far

large

his it

rsaw,

rkish

ended

would

ation

The

vith a

at the

pain,

e was

that

until

ng an

with

,000.

that

ter to

pend-

ourse,

ess of

isit to

ely at

nown ke of

ander

ulties

lasted

nce of

the

the German Princes have been described in glowing terms, though nothing could be more contemptible than the willingness of these royal valets to accept the fragments from the Imperial table. The Emperor of Austria was not present, and it remains a doubt whether he expressed any wish so to be. Napoleon's reception of his Envoy was not flattering, neither was the manner in which he spoke to him of his Sovereign. A very curious feature in the Conference was the line taken by Talleyrand, who, though not in office and out of favour, was in attendance. On meeting Alexander, 'Sire,' said he, 'what are you here to do? It is for you to save Europe, and this by firmness with Napoleon. The French people are civilized, their Sovereign is not; the Sovereign of Russia is civilized, his people are not: it is for the Sovereign of Russia to be the ally of the French people.' He painted France drained of her most useful subjects; saturated with military glory; the whole population from the Marshals to the peasantry craving for peace. He pointed out that the extension of France beyond the Alps, the Pyrenees, and the Rhine was solely for the personal ambition of Napoleon, and must be given up at his death. Alexander admitted in his correspondence the wisdom of this advice, which accorded with the distrust of the future which had of late occupied his mind and continued to influence his conduct. The impression made by Talleyrand was deep, and was long afterwards remembered and acted upon. His advice has been stigmatised as treacherous, and certainly it was not to give it that Talleyrand was called to the conference, but it was sound, and, as events proved, as much to the advantage of Napoleon and the French nation as to the other Powers of Europe. Napoleon valued the Russian alliance as an instrument by which he trusted to subjugate the whole of Europe. Talleyrand saw that Napoleon was intoxicated with the prospect, which if fulfilled would not really be advantageous to France, but which was more likely to provoke, as it did, a resistless combination against France.

Napoleon's immediate object was to exhibit his power to the world, to parade his close alliance with Russia and his command over the whole of Germany, then by its princes visibly assembled at his feet. That of Alexander was to secure his hold upon the Danubian Provinces, and to press forward the conquest of Turkey. For this he had recognized the whole of Napoleon's conquests in Italy, the Peninsula, Germany, and the Low Countries, and even in the unacquired kingdom of Spain.

Although unaware that his personal ascendency over Alexander was not what it had been at Tilsit, it was not without very evident anxiety that Napoleon prepared for the meeting. As

to Prussia, on Frederick's ratification of the treaty Napoleon promised to withdraw his troops, and to receive an envoy. With this assurance and the reduction of the impost from 144 millions of francs to 124 millions, Alexander was fain to be content, and he agreed to allow the transfer of Hanover to Westphalia, Prussia receiving an equivalent, which was never given and never intended to be given. Napoleon also gave a verbal promise to withdraw from Warsaw, and not again to occupy the Grand Duchy. The next question was that of Turkey, the expedition against which Napoleon, occupied with Spain, and having regard to the doubtful attitude of Austria. wished to postpone indefinitely. Alexander, looking to the large share contended for by Napoleon, thought it better to agree to this, observing that the proposal emanated entirely from Napoleon, both originally at Tilsit and in its revival in February 1808. Wallachia and Moldavia, observed Roumantzof, obtained without co-operation, are worth more to Russia than a contest with France for Constantinople. This also was agreed to verbally, Napoleon probably looking forward to the addition of certain qualifying restrictions. But, although secretly the invasion was abandoned, it was agreed to take advantage of the alarm which the prospect of it had created in England, and that the two Sovereigns should address a letter to the King of England, which being accompanied by a joint pressure upon Austria warning her of the Franco-Russian alliance might, it was hoped, induce England, bereft of her contemplated ally, to negociate for peace. But when it came to the mode of approaching Austria, the views of the two Emperors were found to be widely different. Alexander, though he wished Austria to refrain from taking the offensive, did not desire to see her seriously weakened, and refused to be a party to an attack upon her, though he was willing, did she attack France, to take part against her. This did not satisfy Napoleon, who was for insisting by force upon her disarmament. Neither Sovereign wished for war, but Napoleon, modo suo, wished to render it impossible by force, Alexander by negociation only. The fact was, the interests of the two Sovereigns were different. Napoleon, once occupied in Spain, was well aware that Austria was not unlikely to take the opportunity to employ her army, the expense of which was a heavy burden upon her impoverished exchequer; and in that event he knew that England was prepared to organize a new coalition in which Spain and Portugal, Sweden, part of Germany, and even Turkey, might be expected to join. It was evident that all turned upon Austria; and if she could be persuaded or forced to disarm, the proposals for a coalition would oleon

nvoy.

from

in to

rer to

never

ive a

in to

at of

with

stria,

the

er to

tirely

al in

atzof,

nan a

rreed

ition

7 the

f the

and

ng of

upon

it, it

y, to

oacho be

frain

ously

her,

part

for

reign

er it

fact

leon,

not

ense

uer;

d to

eden,

join.

could

ition

ould

would fall to the ground. But for this the threats of France alone would not be sufficient, and in them Russia refused to join. Napoleon was furious: he offered to guarantee the integrity of the Austrian Empire, and to retain but one Prussian fortress, but in vain. Alexander continued smooth, courteous, but immovable. 'Your Emperor,' said Napoleon to Caulaincourt, 'is as obstinate as a mule, he is deaf to all he does not wish to hear.' Passive resistance irritated Napoleon beyond measure. On one occasion, in the heat of a discussion, his temper gave way; he flung down his hat and stamped upon it with rage. Alexander paused, looked him full in the face, and smiled. 'You are violent,' said he calmly, 'I am stubborn; violence has no effect upon me. Let us talk, let us reason, or I leave; ' and moved towards the door. Napoleon recovered himself, became even friendly, but with as little success. Alexander was not to be moved to employ force against Austria. The aggression he anticipated was not from Austria but from France; in which indeed morally he was right, but technically in error.

Napoleon, thus isolated, threatened an immediate attack, in which case, notwithstanding the opposition of Alexander, he would have to retain the Prussian fortresses. 'Is it you,' he said, 'my friend, my ally, who wish me to abandon the only

points from which I can take Austria in the flank?'

The alliance was also threatened from another quarter. As early as the autumn of 1808 a divorce from Josephine had been talked of, and a marriage with one of Alexander's sisters thought not improbable. The subject had, however, not been mentioned at Tilsit, nor does it appear in the correspondence with Caulaincourt. Alexander had heard the rumour, and did not wish for the alliance; but aware that refusal on his part would be ill taken, he always spoke of his sisters as under the legal control of the Empress-mother, who he knew would not consent to the marriage. At Erfurt, Napoleon, having decided on a divorce, employed Talleyrand and Caulaincourt to ascertain the views of Alexander and to lead him to introduce the subject. They succeeded, and Alexander listened favourably to the suggestion, but Napoleon was careful not to commit himself, and caused the divorce to be spoken of as a possibility only. No actual Princess was named, and the Empress-mother at once married her eldest daughter to the Duke of Oldenburg. The other sister was not quite of marriageable age, so that in any case a delay must occur. The matter therefore was left undetermined, and thus added one more to the delicate and dangerous questions between the two Emperors.

While these discussions were proceeding, the two Ministers

for Foreign Affairs for their respective countries, Champagny and Roumantzof, were engaged upon the details of a treaty. France and Russia were to act in concert towards England, and each agreed to recognize the acquisitions of the other in Europe and on the Danube. Napoleon wished the last item to be secret to avoid difficulties with the Porte, but Alexander required as full a recognition as he gave, which Napoleon, to some extent, admitted. The settlement of any difference with the Porte was to be left to Russia alone. If Austria attacked France, Alexander undertook to act, but not otherwise.

And thus the Conference broke up, and the Sovereigns parted, with every appearance of cordiality, but with distrust and enmity in their hearts. The meeting raised more difficulties than it removed, but Napoleon, at least, felt sure that though Russia might or might not join him against Austria, the alliance rendered war less imminent, and put a check upon the still dangerous hatred of Prussia, and upon any hostile movement in

Germany.

Russia also had some reason to be satisfied. She had held her own on the disputed points in spite of chicane and bullying, and she had secured the recognition of her hold on the Danubian Provinces, which brought her an important stage on her way to Constantinople. It was something too to be left to negociate or to contend with the Porte unencumbered by a very astute ally.

The most pressing of Napoleon's engagements was the conquest of the Spanish Peninsula, and he made the march of his troops across France towards the Pyrenees the occasion of a great military display. Metternich, at that time Austrian Ambassador at Paris, had to bear the brunt of his ill-humour. In reply to the repeated attacks of Napoleon he claimed the right of every independent nation to take steps for its own protection, and declared that Austria had not exceeded this right. Napoleon, on the other hand, asserted that the preparations of Austria far exceeded this, and evidently pointed to an aggressive war. There was truth on both sides. Austria, if really assured against an attack, would certainly not have moved; but having every reason to expect an attack from Napoleon, she contemplated an absolute necessity for anticipating it.

In his relations with Austria, Alexander, on the whole, kept faith. He had plainly declared he would be no party to an attack on Austria, nor to the dismemberment of that Empire, and Napoleon never counted on the alliance as worth much in the field. 'It is essential,' he wrote to Caulaincourt, 'that our alliance with Russia should be believed in by Europe, but I

myself believe in it no longer.'

Austria

Austria strove hard to induce Alexander to remain neutral, but to this he gave no encouragement. But he complained that the King of Saxony was reviving the old Polish orders of the White Eagle and St. Stanislaus, and that the Poles were everywhere being stirred up to take part in the war. At the request of Napoleon he massed his forces on the frontier of Galicia, but stipulated that no other troops should be allowed to enter that province, and especially none from the Grand Duchy of Warsaw.

As the French forces were withdrawn from Germany, and those of the Rhenish Confederation placed upon the peace establishment, Austria, having regard to the state of Spain, and to the known repugnance of Russia for the war, thought the opportunity too favourable to be neglected, and opened the campaign as before in Bavaria. Untaught by experience, the Austrians thought to take Napoleon by surprise, and to strike a blow before his arrival. As might have been foreseen, they were mistaken. Establishing his head-quarters at Ulm, he moved his Italian forces upon the Danube, placed Massena, Lannes, and Davoust at the head of his divisions, drew back the Austrians from Landstrat, and, though after a severe and doubtful struggle, overcame them at Aspern and Eckmähl, entered Vienna, and gained a decisive and final, but dearly

bought victory, at Wagram.

The movements of his Russian allies were so slow and their conduct so unsatisfactory that a French-Polish force led by Poniatowski was dispatched into Galicia; and under the treaty that concluded the war, but a small part of Galicia was allotted to Russia, and a much larger share was attached to the Grand Alexander was mortally offended, and Napoleon's explanations were scarcely less satisfactory. As, however, the proposed marriage was on the tapis, an appearance of friendship was preserved, and Caulaincourt and Roumantzof were directed to prepare a convention such as might be satisfactory to Alexander. They accordingly proposed that it should be declared that Poland should never be re-established as a nation, and that the terms Poland and Polish should not be employed in any public document. Also the Polish orders were to be abolished, and no Russian-Polish subjects to be employed in the Grand Duchy. With this Alexander expressed himself satisfied, and it only remained to obtain the ratification of Napoleon.

While the Convention was in progress, the formal demand for the hand of the Grand Duchess Ann, then aged sixteen, arrived at St. Petersburg; and such was the irritability or impatience of Napoleon, that he stipulated for an answer in two

Vol. 177.—No. 354.

of a strian mour. right ction, oleon, ia far war. rainst

every

ed an

pagny

reaty.

, and

urope

secret ed as

xtent,

Porte

ance,

arted.

and ulties

ough iance

still

ent in

held

ying.

ubian

ray to

ate or

ally.

con-

of his

kept to an apire, ch in t our but I

ustria

days. Alexander required ten, and before that term expired the Convention had to be sent off to Paris, of course without an answer to the proposal. Alexander expressed himself as personally in favour of the marriage, but required other ten days, and subsequently a longer period, that he might take the pleasure of the Empress-mother. Napoleon, thinking himself trifled with, anticipated the refusal, declined to ratify the Convention, and made a formal demand to the Austrian Ambassador for an Austrian Grand Duchess. The Ambassador, prepared for the change, at once assented, and the Russian Court was left to digest the affront as best it might. The story of the double negociation is related by various authorities in various ways; the best account is probably that given by Maret, who was in office and in Napoleon's confidence,

and whose fault was subservience rather than duplicity. The rupture did not at once take place, but it was hastened by reports of Napoleon's ill-health, and that Alexander contemplated his early death, and his own succession to the Universal Empire. It appears that Napoleon was indeed at that time threatened with the disease fatal to his father, and finally to himself; and under the influence of this irritation he once again gave way to a most undiplomatic burst of temper upon Prince Kourakine, the Russian Ambassador, who declared his master's intentions to be pacific. 'No,' said the Emperor, 'your master's intentions are not pacific. He wishes for war, and his troops are concentrating upon the Niemen. Emperor deceives and wins over all my envoys.' 'You also,' he added, turning to Caulaincourt, 'have become Russian. also are seduced by Alexander.' 'Yes, Sire,' was the honest and bold reply, 'because I believe him to be French.' Nor, though he tried both threats and caresses, could he ever win over that faithful servant to a change of opinion. The war that ensued, and its fatal consequences, have already been related in a previous article in this Review; moreover, with the war the correspondence between the Sovereigns ceased, nor was it ever again resumed.

ART. VI.—Vedische Mythologie. Von Alfred Hillebrandt. Erster Band: Soma und verwandte Götter. Breslau, 1891.

Thas seemed strange to many people that the discovery of the ancient Vedic Mythology should have produced so complete a revolution in the study of mythology in general, and that not only the legends and traditions of Greeks and Romans, but the folklore of uncivilized races also should have received new light from the hymns of the 'Rig-Veda.' That the 'Veda' should have supplied the key to many secrets in the ancient mythology of the Zend-Avesta, is natural enough, considering how close the contact must have been between the ancestors of the Vedic and the Avestic poets when they were still worshipping the same gods, performing the same sacrifices, and employing priests actually bearing the same technical titles in Sanskrit and Zend. And though the relationship between the Vedic Rishis and the earliest poets and lawgivers of Greece and Italy is far more distant, still we know that they all must once have spoken the same language, believed in the same gods, and shared in the same folklore. We need not be surprised, therefore, at their having preserved a few of the names, legends, and customs which had sprung up before the final separation of the Aryan family of speech. But that a study of the 'Veda' should help us to understand the origin of the folklore of Polynesian, of African, and American races, cannot be due to the same cause, but only to the fact that mythology in some shape or other represents a natural phase in the evolution of human thought and human language, and that the same motives which we see at work in the 'Veda' were at work in producing the folklore of lower and less civilized tribes.

But why, it has been asked, should the 'Veda' offer the key to the secrets of mythology in every part of the world? And why should not the folklore of uncivilized races also reflect some light on the dark corners of Vedic mythology? First of all, such a question is hardly justified; for there are cases where the legends of uncivilized races have helped us to decipher the meaning of Greek, Roman, and Sanskrit myths. And although we cannot admit any genealogical relationship between the stories of Indian sages and Maori story-tellers, the analogies between them are often so strong, that we dare not ascribe them to mere accident, still less to historical events. That is something gained, and something very considerable; for, if properly understood, it excludes altogether the possibility of what are called 'euhemeristic theories,' as lately revived by Mr. Herbert Spencer. But in other respects also the comparison of the mythologies of

ART.

xpired

out an

s per-

days,

ce the

ify the

ustrian

mbas-

nd the

might.

ly that

idence,

astened

er con-

to the

deed at

er, and

tion he

temper leclared

mperor, for war,

Your

also,' he

. You

honest

' Nor,

ver win

he war

ly been

er, with

sed, nor

uncivilized races has been very helpful, as supplying certain analogies, and, if analogies, then certain intelligible motives in the mythology of the Aryan inhabitants of India. Such cases where the traditions of uncivilized races have furnished a key to Vedic legends, may be rare; yet they exist, and should not be neglected in our estimate of the scientific value of the traditions

of so-called savage races.

What gives to Vedic mythology its own peculiar value, is not so much its antiquity as the unformed and unsettled state in which we find it. Vedic mythology represents to us mythology in a state of fermentation, while all other mythologies have passed through that state, and stand before us in a more or less finished and settled state. In the Veda we can watch the process of mythological incubation. The germs, the so-called mythological roots, may be the same everywhere; but whereas in the Homeric mythology nothing but what was felt to be fittest has survived, while all the rest has vanished, the Veda has preserved to us a number of myths, springing up in wild confusion one by the side of the other, all differing in form, though all containing the same radical elements.

For a long time there have been two schools of interpreters, one preferring a solar, the other a meteoric explanation of certain groups of Aryan myths. Their differences have often been laid hold of by classical scholars as showing the untrustworthiness of Comparative Mythology in general. We know better now. It has been shown, for instance, that the natural phenomena of sunrise, the conquest of the night by the weapons of the solar hero, the return of light and life, and the spreading out of the bright blue sky, were ascribed by some of the Vedic poets to the same invisible or divine agents who by other poets were represented as fighting the black clouds with their thunderbolts, as refreshing with rain the whole of nature, and in the end as bringing back the bright blue sky resplendent with the rays of the sun.

Thus while in some poems the Sun (Sûrya) under his different names, and the Dawn (Ushas) under her different names, are recognized as the chief actors in the drama of the morning, other poets ascribe the principal part in this daily battle to Indra, the god of the blue sky, or to Agni, the god of fire and light. But the same Agni and the same Indra are likewise credited with the chief acts in the meteoric drama of the thunderstorm. They are supposed to hurl the lightnings against the demon of the black sky, to tear him to pieces, to deliver the rain-giving cows kept captive by him, and in the end to secure the triumph of the god of the blue sky. Hence many of the sayings

sayings which apply to the sun and the morning are equally applicable to Agni as the god of fire and light, and to Indra as the god of the blue sky, and we find in consequence the same divine heroes destroying the demons of the night and the demons of the black thundercloud. We can thus understand how the different interpretations proposed by the solar and meteoric schools have their origin and their justification in the as yet insufficiently differentiated state of early Vedic mythology,—a state which has passed away almost completely, before we become acquainted with the mythologies of other races.

Other indications of this unfinished process of mythological fermentation can be seen in the many names assigned in the 'Veda' to one and the same physical phenomenon. The Sun, for instance, appears in the 'Veda' not only in its beneficent character as Sûrya, Savitar, Vishnu, and as the friend of Indra, but it becomes likewise, as a pernicious power, the enemy of Indra, and is then conquered by him in company with such

other demons as Vritra, Sushna, and Kuyava.

Again, the Dawn is represented not only as a beautiful maiden, but likewise as a horse, as a bird, sometimes as the daughter of the Sky, sometimes as the beloved of the Sun, often as followed by him, sometimes as conquered and destroyed by him in his fiery embraces. Nothing can be more perplexing than the various forms which the Moon assumes in the poetry of the 'Veda.' The Moon is called the young (yuvan), the child (sisu), the son of the Sky, or of Dyaus (divah sisu), or of the Sun (sûryasya sisu). But in another place, the Sun, though being the father of the Moon, is said to have swallowed his child, or to have drawn the Moon towards himself as a teacher draws his pupil. Then, again, the Moon is represented as consumptive and as gradually dying, till born again to a new life. Or the Moon is supposed to have been carried off and to be kept prisoner, till Indra, in some shape or other, delivers him, while in other passages the Moon appears as an enemy of Indra and is defeated by him. There are many more forms of lunar mythology, some of them growing to maturity and developed into complete legends, others only hinted at here and there, and afterwards completely forgotten. Vedic mythology has often been called chaotic. This, no doubt, is true. But this chaotic phase of mythology is extremely valuable to the student of mythology, as showing us how numerous are the germs which are presupposed by the later growth of a perfect system of mythology. And this is the chief reason why Vedic mythology has so often proved a master-key to open some of the secret chambers of other mythological

rpreters, f certain een laid orthiness ter now. omena of the solar at of the poets to ets were derbolts, e end as e rays of different

certain

ives in

h cases

a key

not be

ditions

alue, is

ed state

to us

a more

we can

rms, the

ere; but

s felt to

he Veda

in wild

n form,

mes, are morning, battle to fire and likewise a of the sa against eliver the to secure ny of the sayings mythological systems, whether of Greeks and Romans, or of

Polynesians and Melanesians.

For a long time the attention of Oriental and classical scholars has been pre-occupied to such an extent by the solar elements of Vedic mythology, that other sources from which ancient myths were known to have flown have been almost entirely neglected. And yet it had often been pointed out by scholars who took a more comprehensive view of ancient mythology, that though the sun would naturally supply a very large portion of mythological thought and language, the second luminary, the moon, must everywhere have occupied a very prominent place in the sphere of man's earliest interests; nay, must for many reasons have formed in ancient times a more familiar subject of meditation and conversation than even the sun.

To the ancient beholders of the sky, sun and moon were really inseparable; they were like twins, or like two eyes serving one and the same purpose. What to us seems most natural, the daily return of sun and moon, offered to the earliest thinkers the most startling, the most thought-inspiring problem. Hence their language with reference to sun and moon sounds often very strange and exaggerated to us, and it requires an effort before we can discover anything human and rational in what is called the solar and lunar mythology of the ancient world. We, with our clocks and calendars, can hardly imagine how completely the social, political, and religious life of our earlies ancestors depended on the observation of sun and moon. The deep dualism of nature which in later times assumed the character of bright and dark, nay of good and evil, was originally the dualism of day and night, of spring and winter, of life and death, and was naturally symbolised by the two ruling luminaries, the sun and the moon. It was generally imagined that the sun must have occupied the first and principal place in determining days and nights, months, seasons, years. But long before the annual return of the sun from tropic to tropic could be determined and utilised for chronometric purposes, the sennights or weeks, the fortnights, and the months had been determined and named under the guidance of the moon.

It is well known that, on account of this ruling influence of the moon on the toils and tasks of the earliest cultivators of the soil, the moon was conceived in Sanskrit and other ancient languages, not as a feminine, as the wife or sister of some solar god, but as a masculine, as himself the measurer of time, the ruler of days and nights, the lord of the seasons, the guardian of all the more or less solemn occupations and observances con-

nected

nected with the return of the seasons; nay, in the end as the first ruler and lawgiver, whether human or divine, and as the founder of social order at the very dawn of civilized life.

ns, or of

classical

the solar

n which

almost

d out by

nt myth-

a very

e second

l a very

sts; nay,

a more

an even

on were

wo eyes

ms most

e earliest

problem.

n sounds

an effort

n what is

rld. We,

ow com-

r earliest

on. The

the cha-

riginally

f life and

ng lumi-

ined that

place in

But long

pic could

, the sen-

had been

fluence of

ors of the

r ancient

ome solar

time, the

guardian

nces connected

We must remember, however, that like the sun, the moon also, when it had once been conceived and named as an agent, became the representative not only of the luminous globe seen in the sky, but of all the events that were dependent on its movements. The unknown agent behind the sun, or the deity of the sun, was recognized as the agent of the day also. Even with us day and sun still stand for one another. Yestersun was a common word for yesterday, and Tennyson speaks of 'the day as breaking from underground.' Having become the representative of the morning and of the day lasting from dawn to sunset, the deity of the sun was soon transformed into the deity of the bright sky also, under all its aspects; he became the author of the spring of the year, the giver of light and life, and in the end the supreme deity of the world. It was just the same with The moon was not only the light of the night, the the moon. dispeller of darkness, but soon became the giver of rest and sleep, the bestower of rain and fertility; nay, in its waning and returning character, the first symbol suggestive of life and death and immortality. All these thoughts were so many germs which might either perish or take shape in mythological traditions. Thus we see that in many mythologies sun and moon, performing similar operations in giving light, whether by day or by night, became amalgamated, or at all events were conceived as closely connected and interdependent. They were looked upon as brothers, as brother and sister, as twins and as more than twins, as really inseparable. The whole universe was distributed between them. If we remember that in the Veda, Agni, fire, often represents the sun, and Soma the moon, we shall understand what the author of the 'Satapatha-brâhmana' meant, when he said (i. 6, 3, 23): 'Whatever is moist belongs to Soma, what is dry to Agni. The sun belongs to Agni, the moon to Soma; the day to Agni, the night to Soma; the waxing half-moon to Agni, the waning to Soma.'

The first beginnings of this solar and lunar dualism can be traced in the traditions of less civilized races also. Thus, according to the story-tellers of the Polynesian Islands, as described to us by the careful pen of the Rev. W. Gill, sun and moon, besides being the two eyes of the sky, are often represented as the twin children of the sky. Vâtea or Avatea means 'moon' in the dialects of Eastern Polynesia, but it is also the name of their supreme deity, the father of gods and men (Gill, 'Myths and Songs,' p. 4). The one eye of Vâtea was human,

the

the other a fish's eye. His right side was furnished with an arm, his left with a fin. We are told that his two magnificent eyes are rarely visible at the same time. In general, whilst the one, called by mortals the sun, is seen here in the upper world, the other eye, called by men the moon, shines in Avaiki, the lower world. Sometimes the sun was called the right eye of Vâtea, the moon the left eye. Aryan mythology generally shrinks from anything that seems unnatural and monstrous. A god, half fish and half man, would have offended their sense of beauty and harmony. The plastic imagination of the Greeks would, as much as possible, have abstained from such combinations. But even the Greeks had not forgotten to call the sun the eye of Zeus, and Vedic poets, when speaking of the two heavenly eyes ('Rig-Veda,' i. 72, 10), are not afraid to call the sun the eye or the light of the gods,* and the moon the eye of the fathers.† In the 'Satapatha-brâhmana,' vii. 1, 2, 7, the sky is called the head of Pragapati, the Lord of creation, the sun and moon his two eyes. The eye on which he rested was the moon, and therefore the moon, we are told, is somewhat closed, because something ran out of it.

While the Vedic poets are prepared to speak of sun and moon as two children playing around the sacrifice, the one looking down on all things, the other ordering the seasons and being born again and again ('Rig-Veda,' x. 85, 18), the Polynesians venture much further. They not only call sun and moon the twin children of the sky, but they tell of Vâtea that he had a child from Papa. But another, Tongaiti, claimed the child as his own. So they quarrelled, and at last the child was cut in two. Then Vâtea took the upper part as his share, squeezed it into a ball and tossed it into the heavens, where it became the sun. Tongaiti received the lower part, but left it a day or two on the ground. Then seeing the brightness of Vâtea's half, he too made a ball of his share, while the sun was in Avaiki or the nether-world, and tossed it into the dark sky, where it became the moon. The moon's pale colour was due

to the loss of blood.

This is a fair specimen of the thoughts and conversation of uncivilized people with regard to the most prominent phenomena of nature. They may seem coarse or very childish to us, and yet we know that even Greek mythology is not quite free from similar montrosities. They show at all events that there existed

† 'Sankhayana Sr.,' Satras iii. 16, 2: Kandrama vai pitrinam kakshus, 'the moon is the eye of the Pitris.'

^{* &#}x27;Maitreyî Samhîtâ,' iv. 2, 1: Asau vâ âdityo devânâm kakshus, 'the sun is the eye of the Devas.'

vith an

nificent

whilst

upper Avaiki,

ght eye

enerally

us. A

ense of Greeks

mbina-

sun the

eavenly

un the

of the

in and

moon,

in and

he one

ns and

Poly-

in and

ned the

ld was

here it

left it

ness of

un was

rk sky, as due

tion of

omena

is, and

e from existed

the sun

us, 'the

desire

a desire for an explanation of physical phenomena, and this has always been the beginning of human wisdom. Nay, some of the things which we have lately had to read about Mars and its inhabitants are scarcely less childish than these Polynesian legends about sun and moon. What seems to have puzzled the early observers of the moon very much were the dark spots on There is hardly a race that has not suggested some explanation of these lunar blemishes. The Polynesians, who recognize a woman in the moon and call her Ina, have a pretty story to tell of how the moon fell in love with Ina, one of the four daughters of Kui, the Blind; how he descended from heaven and carried her off. She became a pattern wife, being always busy, so that on a clear night she might be seen with a pile of leaves ('ta rau tao o Ina') with which she feeds her never-failing oven of food, also with a pair of tongs of a split cocoa-nut branch to enable her to adjust the live coals without burning her fingers. Ina is indefatigable in preparing a piece of resplendent cloth, the white clouds. The great stones needful for this purpose are also visible. As soon as her tapa is well beaten and brought into the desired shape, she stretches it out to dry on the upper part of the blue sky, the edges all around being secured with large stones. It is left there to When the operation is completed, she takes up the stones and casts them aside with violence. Crash, crash they go against the upper surface of the solid vault, producing what mortals call thunder. The cloth itself glistens like the sun. And hence it is that when hastily gathering her many rolls of whitest tapa, flashes of light fall upon the earth which mortals call lightning.

This shows what imagination can read in a few dark spots in the moon. There can be no doubt that Ina is meant for the woman carried off by the moon, who was in love with her, for Ina actually means 'moon,' and occurs in other Polynesian

languages as Sina and Hina (l. c., p. 46).

What is important for us to observe is that, like the Vedic Indians, the Polynesians ascribed not only rain, but thunder and lightning also to the moon. The most perplexing feature, however, about the movements of the moon was its growing smaller and smaller every night till it disappeared altogether, and its growing again till it reached its full size. These changes of the moon occupied the thoughts of the early observers of celestial events even more than the occasional eclipses of the moon. Eclipses no doubt filled the people with a sudden terror, and the only explanation they could think of was readily accepted, namely, that some hostile invisible power

swallowed the moon and then set it free again. But the regular waning and waxing of the moon required a different explanation. As a rule, regular events appeal much more strongly for an intelligible explanation than casual accidents, and hence they have called forth a much larger amount of mythology. People had to think of a regular cause in order to explain a regularly occurring event. But if we wish to understand the strange explanations given by the Vedic Indians of the waxing and waning of the moon, we must first consider some more of the superstitions which they had formed to themselves about the moon, As soon as a belief in Gods and Fathers (ancestral spirits) had sprung up, nothing was more natural than that the bright gods or Devas should have had their abode assigned to them in the sunny sky. And if so, what remained as an abode of the Fathers except the moon and the nocturnal sky? in some cases the Fathers were believed to share in the end the bright seats of the gods, the earliest belief seems always to have been that they were transferred to the moon, sometimes also to the stars. Such an idea would receive a powerful support from the awe-inspiring character of the moonlight nights, when, in the sombre and pale glamour of the rays of the moon, many things are seen or imagined which vanish like a dream in the bright light of day.

Another idea which likewise confirmed the belief that the Fathers enjoyed immortality in the moon, was the close connexion between the moon and a man's life on earth. We must not imagine that we shall ever be able to trace all the tributaries which entered from various sources into the broad stream of ancient mythology. Certain it is, however, that a belief in the moon, as the abode of the Fathers, was widely spread among the people speaking Aryan languages. To the present day the peasants in Swabia are heard to say: 'May I go to the moon, if I did it,' instead of 'May I die, if I did it;' nay, people who work on the Sabbath day are threatened even now that they will go to the moon, that is, that they will die and be punished in the moon. A more startling idea-peculiar, it would seem, to India—was that of the moon serving as the food of the gods. And yet, though it sounds strange to us, it was not so very unnatural an idea after all. The gods, though invisible, had been located in the sky. In the same sky the golden moon, often compared to a round of golden butter, was seen regularly to decrease. And if it was being consumed by anybody, by whom could it be consumed if not by the gods? Hence the ready conclusion that it was so, and that it was in fact this food which secured to the gods their immortal life. If so much

much had once been granted, then came the question, how the moon was gradually increased and restored to its fulness? And here the old superstition came in that the souls of the departed entered the moon, so that the waxing of the moon might readily be accounted for by this more ancient article of faith. Hence the systematised belief that the moon wanes while it is being eaten by the gods, and that it waxes while it is being filled by the departed souls entering it. A last conclusion was that the gods, when feeding on the moon, were really feeding

on the souls of the departed.

Such ideas do not spring up all at once. They grow slowly and casually. Mythology was not elaborated systematically and according to a fixed plan. Mythology began with the naming of certain objects and a few short sayings about them, often with proverbs, riddles, saws, in which old men and women embodied the results of their daily observations. It was at a much later time, when many of these sayings had become idiomatic and often unintelligible, that they were put together so as to form whole cycles of mythological lore. It has been long recognized as the first task of Comparative Mythology to discover and separate these original germs or radicals, which form the foundation of mythological language, as the roots form the foundation of all human speech. Such radical elements are well known from Solar Mythology. For instance, the Sun is called the child of Heaven and Earth; and as soon as that idea has taken possession of the popular mind, a large number of derivative myths would spring up almost spontaneously, such as the Earth being the wife of Heaven, or Spring being the marriage of Heaven and Earth. If by chance Heaven and Earth were also conceived as brother and sister, tragic ingredients would soon show themselves, which would become still more terrible, if the Sun, once having been conceived as the son of Heaven and Earth, should by some independent poet have been addressed as the husband of his own mother, the Earth. Again nothing was more natural than to speak of the Sun as following the Dawn. The follower would easily become the lover; and if the Dawn, as soon as she was touched by the first rays of the rising Sun, fled from his fiery embraces and vanished, how could a poet with any feeling for nature help telling the old story of Phœbus and Daphne, though he himself might be unaware that Daphne was an ancient word which meant originally the burning and shining Dawn (from dah, 'to burn'), just as much as Phœbus meant at first the burning and bright Sun? It is curious that this imagery, which to us may seem sentimental and far-fetched, comes quite natural

regular planagly for ce they People cularly ge exvaning supermoon, s) had t gods

ays to es also apport when, many in the

em in

of the

hough

at the conmust taries am of in the mong y the moon, e who they ished seem, gods. very , had noon, ularly

y, by

e the

this

If so

much

natural to all children of nature, to poets and prophets in modern as well as in ancient times. Thus Master Eckhart, when trying to find an image for the absorption of the human soul into the Divine, speaks of the soul as the dawn, lost in the

embraces of the sun.

But while these solar elements have long been recognized, and while ever so many solar myths in Sanskrit and Greek mythology have been traced back to their simple radicals, there has hitherto been a kind of tacit agreement among Sanskrit scholars that the moon had no place in Vedic mythology, and that no light could be gained from the 'Veda' to clear up the riddles of lunar mythology in other countries. The reason was that though there was a deity of the moon, occupying a very prominent place in the Vedic Pantheon, namely Soma, this Soma was supposed to have been originally the name of a plant, and of an invigorating and likewise intoxicating beverage extracted from it, and to have become identified with the moon in a secondary phase of mythology only. This Soma-juice was offered to the gods by the Aryas, before they became divided into speakers of Sanskrit and speakers of ancient Persian, into worshippers of Devas and worshippers of Ahuramazda; for the same plant, under the name of Haoma, forms a most important element both of Vedic and of Avestic belief and sacrificial worship. There were no doubt some few scholars who could not bring themselves to believe in so extraordinary a metamorphosis as that of a mere plant into the deity of the moon, but they were few, and even they were satisfied with showing how in a certain number of passages of the 'Veda' Soma was clearly the moon, without any reference to Soma as a plant or a beverage. But it is entirely due to Professor Hillebrandt in his 'Vedische Mythologie,' published in 1891, that we know now that in the earliest mythology of the Vedic poets Soma was primarily the moon, and that its identification with Soma, the plant, and Soma, the juice of it, offered at certain sacrifices, was a secondary phase in the development of lunar mythology. Here, as everywhere else, sacrificial ideas are secondary, mythological thoughts primary. Professor Hillebrandt has really broken new ground and has let in light where all before was darkness. His book shows how much has still to be done in Vedic mythology, and how even the most generally accepted theories require constant revision and amendment. Such new discoveries, whether in Vedic or Egyptian or Babylonian philology, though they are welcomed by all true scholars, are apt to shake the faith of the outside public, and are gladly taken advantage of by captious critics. These critics are like sailors who never venture to step on board a ship, unless unless it is sase in harbour; the very sight of a vessel in a rough sea makes them sea-sick. In their eyes every Columbus is a fool. They will gladly take part in celebrating the centenaries of great discoveries, but for the struggling sailor before he has reached terra firma, they have nothing but ridicule and pharisaical scorn. In reading Professor Hillebrandt's volume, it is true that one cannot help wondering how scholars could have failed to see what he has brought out so clearly, namely, that the moon under the name of Soma, and under various other names, such as Indu, Drapsa, Ûrmi, Utsa, Samudra, Kosa, &c., sormed from the very first a most important and prominent ingredient of Vedic mythology; nay, as he asserts with some pardonable exaggeration, the most important of all.

That there was some mystery about Soma, or that there were in the 'Veda' more than one Soma, was known and proclaimed by the Vedic poets themselves. They speak of one Soma whom everybody knows, namely the plant that yielded the intoxicating liquor, so highly celebrated in the 'Veda' and the 'Avesta,' but they hint also that there was another Soma whom no one knew but the Brâhmans. Thus we read, ix. 85, 3, 'Some one thinks that he drinks Soma, when they crush the plant; but the Soma whom the Brâhmans know, no one feeds on him.' What that true Soma is, is clearly indicated in the preceding verses: 'Soma is resting in the sky. Through Soma the Âdityas (gods) are strong, through Soma the earth is great; Soma is placed in

the lap of the Nakshatras (stars).'

ts in

hart,

ıman

n the

, and

ology

herto

t the

could

nyth-

was

n the

have

and

have

nyth-

y the

skrit

and

name

and

loubt

ve in

into

were

es of

rence

ae to

ed in

fthe

ntifi-

fered

ment

deas

lille-

here

ill to

rally

Such

nian

olars,

are

ritics

ship,

nless

These verses were pointed out many years ago as showing that Soma was here clearly meant for the moon, and the Nakshatras for the twenty-seven lunar mansions through which the moon passes from night to night. That Soma is here meant for the moon is now admitted by all scholars. The next following verses leave really no doubt on the subject; for there we read, v. 5, 'Vâyu, the wind, is the guardian of Soma; the moon is the making or the maker (akriti, form) of the years.' And in a later verse the character of the moon comes out still more clearly: 'New and new he is being born, the beacon of days, the moon at the head of the dawns; the moon (kandramas), when approaching, orders the share of the gods, and produces a long life.' Whether the Nakshatras, which hold Soma in their lap, were meant for the twenty-seven lunar mansions in Vedic astronomy, or for stars in general, is still an open question.

But if there are in Vedic mythology two Somas,—one the plant and the intoxicating liquor squeezed out (suta) from it; the other the moon, as one of the great deities,—the next

question

question is, how two apparently so heterogeneous objects came to be called by the same name of Soma? The lowest stratum of mythology is always the etymological, a fact which Professor Hillebrandt has not quite fully realized. Soma is clearly derived from the root su, which means 'to squeeze out' or 'to pour out,' so that suta, 'squeezed out,' is often used as an equivalent of soma. There is no difficulty here. But the same root su had also the meaning of raining, and appears in that sense in many derivatives in Greek, such as "in "et, 'it rains,' in ύετός, 'rain.' Hence so-ma also would originally have meant the agent or the giver of rain, 'the rainer,' verns, and then the rain itself, ὑετός, lastly the place or the source of rain, namely the moon. To us it may seem strange that the moon should have been called 'the rainer,' or the source of rain. But there can be little doubt that in ancient times, nay in modern times also, rain was believed to be influenced by the phases of the moon. Thus we read in the 'Aitareya Brâhmana,' viii. 28, 15, 'Kandramaso vai vrishtir gâyate' (rain is born from the moon). And in Hymn i. 105, 1, we read, 'The moon is in the waters;' while in ix. 97, 17, Soma is implored to pour down heavenly rain, and in i. 43, 7, to grant happiness, offspring, and glory. Like other gods, Soma is also called Apâm Napât, the offspring of the waters. Nor must we forget that there are, particularly in hot countries, two kinds of rain or fertilizing moisture, namely dew and rain, the former as important for the growth of plants as the latter. Dew is believed to be most plentiful after moonlight nights, and hence, after the dew had once been ascribed to Soma, rain was naturally ascribed to the same source. Anyhow, whether dew and rain were the same thing or not, the same word which in Sanskrit means 'rain,' varsha, m. and n., appears in Greek as έρση, fem., 'dew.'

There were therefore originally not two, but three Somas: Soma, the rain, the source of vegetable and animal life; Soma, the giver of rain, the measurer of time, the source of the life of men and gods; and Soma, the juice of the plant which, though it has not yet been botanically identified, must have been a plant possessed of some healing and invigorating qualities, yielding a beverage able to call forth the enthusiasm and eloquence of the

early poets ('Rig-Veda,' vi. 47, 3).

It is strange that botanists have hitherto tried in vain to discover a plant that should answer to the description of the Soma plant in the 'Veda' and the 'Avesta.' Professor Hillebrandt has given a full account of the various attempts at finding a plant on the confines of Northern India and Persia possessing the peculiar qualities of the Soma, the juice of which was made

into

bjects

lowest

which

ma is e out'

as an same

n that

ns, in

nt the

e rain ly the

have

can be

also,

moon.

Kan-

And

ters;

venly

glory.

pring

ularly

isture,

wth of

after

been

same

thing

arsha,

omas:

Soma,

life of

ugh it

plant ling a

of the

in to

of the

Hille-

nding

essing

made

into

into the exhilarating and invigorating beverage of the Vedic There is little to add to the information which Professor Hillebrandt has collected, except that Dr. Aitchison has lately stated that Soma must be the Ephedra pachyclade, which in the Harirud valley is said to bear the name of hum, huma, and yahma. This supposition is confirmed by Dr. Joseph Bornmüller, a botanist long resident in Kerman, who identifies the Soma plant with some kind of Ephedra, probably Ephedra distachya, but who remarks that different varieties of Ephedra are to be found from Siberia to the Iberian peninsula, so that we must give up the hope of determining the original home of

the Aryas by means of the habitat of the Soma plant.

We saw before that the Polynesians ascribe thunder and lightning to Ina, the goddess of the moon; and though there seems no very definite reason why the moon should be connected with thunderstorms and rain, yet many things were believed, and are still believed, of the moon for which there is but slender foundation. The mysterious influence of the moon on certain recurring natural phenomena must have struck even the least observant; and the less they were able to account for it, the more ready they would be to accept fanciful explanations. That the tides, for instance, were somehow determined by the There is an old moon, was known at a very early time. proverb often quoted by the people of Travancore, that soft words are better than harsh, that the sea is attracted by the cool moon, and not by the hot sun. That the moon affects somnambulists is equally certain, though equally inexplicable. deners are convinced that vegetation is affected by lunar influences, and many good people expect a change of the weather from a change of the moon. That the growth of the embryo and the birth of a child were determined by the number of moons, could not have escaped the observation of the earliest medical authorities.

In the minds of the Vedic poets the two meanings, that of the moon and that of the juice of the plant, had become so intimately interwoven that whatever applied to Soma, the plant and its carefully prepared juice, was transferred to Soma, the moon, and whatever applied to the moon was transferred to the plant and the beverage. Homonymy has proved here as elsewhere the most prolific mother of myths. In drinking the Soma the Brâhmans imagined they were drinking the immortal juice contained in the moon, nay the moon itself. The moon was sometimes conceived as a vessel (Kosa) holding the life-giving juice, which juice was strained through the sky as the real Soma beverage was purified through some kind of sieve. Again the rushing sound of clarified Soma, poured by the officiating priests through a sieve (pavitra), was identified with the thunder (Rig-Veda, ix. 47, 3), its golden colour was likened to the colour of the lightnings, till at last the Vedic poets themselves seem hardly to have known whether they were speaking of Soma, the moon, or Soma, the juice, or whether they were still thinking of the etymological meaning of soma, as the rain. After a time, however, Soma, the moon, became more and more of an active and a personal god, no longer the visible moon, but the invisible Lord of the moon. As the Lord or the Devata of the moon, Soma fights his enemies, becomes a Vritra-han, a demon-killer; * and in defeating these enemies becomes the benefactor of men, receiving their prayers and their offerings. Hence after a time gods who performed the same acts were supposed to be like each other; nay, in some cases, identical. Thus Indra, represented at first as helping Indu or Soma, the moon, in his struggles ('Rig-Veda,' vi. 44, 22), seems to occupy sometimes the very place of Soma. The victory of Indra is the same as the victory of Indu ('Rig-Veda,' ix. 88,4; Hillebrandt, p. 312). Nay, this Lord of the moon is now supposed, like Indra and Brihaspati, to drink the Soma, and thus to gain strength for the ever-recurring battle (p. 412), till in the end, like many of the other gods, he too became the supreme King of all the gods.

In many parts of the world the rays of the moon are believed to be poisonous, and a person sleeping in the moonlight is supposed to become insane, or, as we say, a lunatic. There are flowers which open and close their petals as they are touched by the rays of the moon. Grandmothers prescribe certain remedies to be taken by children when the moon increases or decreases, and they are not ashamed to confess that even now, in our nineteenth century, they drop a courtesy when they see the new moon for the first time. All this shows that, with or without reason, the moon has always been held responsible for many things which perhaps it is wiser not to attempt to account for.

We have seen thus far how the moon came to be considered as a self-conscious divine power and likewise as the abode of the Fathers; how he became the symbol of life and immortality, partly because he was the giver of rain, without which life on earth would have been impossible, partly because life and time were measured by moons, and the measurer was taken for the maker. Mr. J. A. Farrer, in his interesting work on 'Paganism and Christianity,' remarks (p. 126):

 ^{&#}x27;Atharva-veda,' xix. 27, 2,

'It may seem strange that the moon should have been chosen as the abode of the Fathers, nor does it become less strange, if we find the same belief not only in India, but in many parts of the ancient and modern world. Even if we admitted that sun and moon were believed to be actual human beings, which seems to me to convey no sense at all, there would still remain the question why the moon should have carried off the departed, and how, if a human being, the moon could at the same time have been conceived as a celestial abode.'

We have now, we believe, learnt to understand how such varying beliefs arose side by side, and how different poets were led to speak of the moon as a place filled with fertilizing moisture, as the habitation of the Fathers, and at the same time, if not exactly as a human being, at all events as a self-conscious and rational agent. Such a belief may be difficult for us to conceive, but we know that it was conceived by no less a thinker than Plato; nor is it quite fair to call the idea that some self-conscious agent should be hidden behind the Sun, the Moon, the Sky, and even the Earth, inconceivable or absurd, considering that we have all learnt to conceive the presence of an agent behind the

veil of our own mortal body.

But we must remember that while the germs of mythological thought about the moon which we have hitherto examined are found everywhere, there is one that is peculiar to India and Persia, namely the mixing up of Soma, the moon, with Soma, the intoxicating liquor used by Indians and Persians at their solemn sacrifices. It is strange that the enormous amount of mythological fancy which fills nearly a whole book of the 'Rig-Veda,' the ninth, should have been caused entirely by the homonymy of Soma, the moon, originally the giver of rain, and Soma, the plant, the giver of the sacrificial juice. Yet so it is. Whatever applied to Soma, the moon, was transferred to Soma, the juice; whatever applied to Soma, the juice, was transferred to Soma, the moon. In drinking the invigorating and exhilarating juice of the Soma plant, the Brâhmans imagined that they were drinking the immortal beverage ('Ait. Br.' iv. 4), the amrita or ambrosia, contained in the moon; nay, that they were really feeding on the invigorating or life-giving moon. We may thus actually distinguish four Somas: Soma, the visible moon, the abode of the Fathers; Soma, the lord of the moon; Soma, the receptacle (Kosa) of ambrosia; and Soma, the ambrosia itself. That ambrosia, called amrita in Sanskrit, was originally both the fertilizing rain and the intoxicating beverage, so that in many places it is quite impossible to determine which of these various Somas was thought of by the poets; particularly as these poets themselves seem to delight in the equivocal use Vol. 177.—No. 354.

priests

'Rig-

our of

hardly

moon, of the

time,

active at the

atâ of

ian, a

es the

erings.

were

ntical.

a, the

occupy

is the

randt,

l, like

gain

e end,

King

lieved

ght is

ere are

ouched

certain

ses or

now,

see the

with-

many

idered

ode of

rtality,

life on

d time

for the

ganism

t for.

of terms which apply to Soma, the moon, as well as to Soma, the juice. We saw already how *indu* and *drapsa* came to mean both the moon and a drop of moisture. Other words lent themselves to the same amphibolous use. It so happens that amsu in Sanskrit may be used in the sense of the shoots of a plant and the rays of the moon. $Dh\hat{a}r\hat{a}$ means a stream and a jet of light; parvan, the joint of the plant, and the phases of the moon; $p\hat{a}$ means to strain and purify the Soma juice, and likewise to clarify, to brighten the darkness of the night. All this leads to endless plays of words, or what we can hardly help calling mere puns, which may seem very unworthy of the

ancient Vedic poets, but which nevertheless are a fact.

What we have gained through Professor Hillebrandt's book is a clear conception that Soma, the moon, came first, and not, as was formerly supposed, Soma, the plant; and that Soma, whether the plant or its juice, owes all its poetical imagery to Soma, the moon, not vice versa. We can clearly see now how Soma, the moon or lord of the moon, had passed through a long mythological career in India, quite independent of Soma, the plant. As the dispeller of the darkness of the night, he is introduced in the Vedic hymns as fighting like another Indra. He roars with his thunder, he hurls his lightnings against the demons, the enemies of light; he whets his teeth and sharpens his horns (cornua lunæ?) like a wild bull. He is surrounded and assisted by his friends, Indra, the Maruts, and the Rudras, the storm-gods. In all this there is as yet no trace of the Soma plant. Agni, again, the god of fire and light through the whole of nature, becomes the companion and protector of Soma, nay, becomes almost identified with him in the dual deity of Agni-Shomau. This Agni, as the locum tenens of Soma, is actually called Agni Pavamana; pavamana (purified, brilliant) being the recognized name of Soma. That Agni can thus be conceived as the moon, is clearly implied by a Vedic poet, when he says ('Rig-Veda,' x. 88, 6): 'By night Agni is the head of the world, i.e. the moon; thence rising in the morning he is born as the sun.' Agni, as guardian of the moon (soma-gopâh), says of himself: 'I am Agni, by birth Gâtavedas (the sun); ghrita, butter,* is my eye, the immortal (ambrosia) is in my mouth.' All these are ideas peculiar to the 'Veda,' because possible in the language of the 'Veda' only, and unknown in other mythologies. They sound therefore strange to us, and we find it difficult to enter into them and to appropriate them. But when Soma assumes his own heroic character, we can see

^{*} Cf. 'Rig-Veda,' iii. 26, 7; iv. 58, 1: 'Ghritasya nama guhyam yat asît.'

how he becomes another Indra, almost another Jupiter. He has good weapons (svâyudha); and when he thunders, heaven and earth tremble and have to obey him. We read in 'Rig-Veda,' ix. 86, 9, 'Thundering, he almost made the back of the sky to resound, he under whose command are heaven and earth.' Like Indra, Soma also assumed in certain hymns the character of a supreme deity, and became endowed with such names as ruler, nay, creator of the world. After that there is no excellence that may not be ascribed to him. It is he who is believed to give light to the stars and the sun (ix. 28, 5). It is he who causes the growth of plants and of all living things. In the 'Avesta' also we read: 'When the moon shines, green plants spring from the earth, through the dew at spring-tide.' A step further brings us to Indu or Soma as having made or stretched out heaven and earth, or as having kept them asunder (Hillebrandt, l. c. p. 312). He is called the father of the gods, the leader of men, the inspirer of good thoughts, the source of all wisdom, the very Brâhman among the gods. In the end he stands before us as the Lord of all. At a time when the moon was still felt as nearer to man and as more important than the god of the sun and the bright sky, one poet said ('Rig-Veda,' x. 86, 5): 'As Lord thou reignest over the whole world.' We see here once more how many worlds had passed away, how many thoughts had lived and died, before the Vedic hymns could have been composed. We doubt whether even the authors of these hymns could see as far back into their own antiquity as we can, and whether they understood the antecedents of their gods better than we do.

To us, for instance, there can be no doubt that Ind-u, which means 'a drop,' and is derived from the same root as Ind-ra, the giver of rain, was but another name of the moon as the giver of rain. But in the 'Veda' Indu is represented as an independent deity by the side of Indra. Thus we read ('Rig-Veda,' vi. 39, 3, 4): 'He, Indu (the drop, the moon), O Indra, made the lightless nights light, in the evening and morning of all the autumns. They established him as the beacon of days, and he made the light-born dawns.' Sometimes Indra is represented as fighting in his chariot, while Indu acts as his charioteer ('Ath. Ved.,' viii. 8, 23). Having been called indu, 'drop,' the moon is also called drapsa, which likewise means 'drop.' Thus in 'Rig-Veda,' ix. 78, 4, we read of 'the sweetest drop, the reddish, the delightful,' which is meant for the moon. Indu is raised at last to the rank of a warlike deity, assisting Indra . in his fights against his enemies, the Panis. Nay, the conquest of the Panis is no longer represented as the work of Indra,

t asit.'

Soma,

o mean

ls lent

ns that

ts of a

m and

ases of

ce, and

t. All

hardly

of the

s book

nd not,

Soma,

magery e now

ough a

Soma,

ght, he

another

htnings is teeth

He is

and the

e of the

igh the

Soma,

f Agni-

ctually

ing the

nceived

he says

of the

is born

h), says

ghrita,

mouth.'

find it

an see

but as the work of Indu, the Moon ('Rig-Veda,' ix. 88, 4; Hillebr. p. 312). Soma, again, who originally was meant, like Indu, for the ambrosia contained in the moon, is represented in other hymns as actually drinking the Soma, and thus gathering strength, like Indra, Brihaspati, and other allies of his, in the constant battle against his enemies. What seems to us utterly incongruous is accepted without any misgivings by the Vedic theologians. One of these in the 'Satapathabrâhmana,' 46, 4, 5, says in so many words, 'that Soma, the King, is the food of the gods, namely, the moon.' We can understand now that this was only another attempt to explain the waning of the moon. We saw before how the waxing of the moon had been explained by the constant entrance of the souls of the departed into the moon. Its waning therefore was accounted for by the gods receiving or absorbing these souls and gradually devouring the moon in which the departed dwelt for a time. Soma, the moon, had been conceived not only as the temporal abode, but likewise as the Lord of the departed or the Fathers, and therefore as living with them in the moon. Thus we can understand how Soma is invoked to grant to men an abode in the moon and immortality. One Vedic poet (ix. 113, 7) says:

'Where there is unfailing light, in the world where the sun is placed, in that immortal and imperishable world place me, O bright Soma! Indu (soma juice), run round for Indra!

'Where Vaivasvata is King, where there is the adytum of the sky, where the mighty waters are, there make me immortal! Indu, run round for Indra!'

In later times when the idea had sprung up that eternal life and bliss could be enjoyed with the gods only, or in the world of Brâhman, new legends were invented, according to which the Departed proceeded from the moon to the sun to live for ever with the gods, or in the still more exalted world of Brâhman, the Supreme Being. At first, however, the idea of immortal life was derived from the moon, and immortality was enjoyed in the moon. If people had once learnt to say, 'May I live another moon,' or 'May I live many moons,' it was but a little step that brought them to pray: 'Dear Moon, let me live another month or many more months.' Thus we read viii. 48, 3, 'We drank Soma and have become immortal;' and in verse 7, Soma is implored to prolong human life. In both these passages the primary cause of a long life seems to be the Soma beverage that has been drunk by the worshipper, but the Vedic poets constantly mixed up the ambrosia of the moon 38, 4;

meant,

repre-

d thus

lies of

seems

ivings

patha-

a, the

e can

xplain

ing of

of the

re was

souls

dwelt

t only

parted

moon.

to men

c poet

sun is

bright

of the

Indu,

nal life

world

which

ive for

orld of

dea of

ty was

' May

as but

let me

e read

ortal:

fe. In

s to be

er, but

and

and the juice of the moon-plant. By this most natural process the Moon became the giver of life and the source of immortality. Possessing amrita, i.e. ambrosia or immortality, the Moon could give life and immortality to man. And thus, sooner even than the Sun, the Moon became a great Deva or bright god, the father of the gods, the ruler of the seasons, the lord of time, the giver of life, the ruler and maker of all things,* and the Vedic poets could well exclaim, 'Who is greater than Soma?' When we speak of the moon as having been the first to suggest by its death and resurrection the idea of immortal life, we do not mean this priority in a purely chronological sense. Chronology does not reach into these regions. We rather mean that the conception of another life was more readily suggested by the moon than by the sun. Thus we read in the 'Rig-Veda,' x. 55, 5: 'See the wisdom of the god in its greatness: yesterday he died, to-day he lives again.' We know how even now we can say, 'His sun has set,' instead of 'He has died.' The idea that man's life sets with the setting sun, that the departed have departed with the sun in the West and dwell in the realm of the setting sun, finds expression in many mythologies. The Egyptians have fully elaborated that thought by saying that the soul descends with the sun through the Western Gate, and after traversing with him the lower regions reaches its final abode. In the 'Veda' that final abode is called the world of Yama. Yama, who in the later poems is called the first of mortals, was originally a god, the god of the setting or nocturnal sun, or, according to Professor Hillebrandt, a representative of the nocturnal moon; not, as Professor Roth maintained, a human individual raised to the dignity of a god, but a god sharing the character of humanity, an immortal conceived as a mortal. We shall now better understand why the Zulus and other South African races selected the Moon as sending a message to men that they were immortal; that they would die as the Moon dies, but that they would live again as the Moon lives again.

There is a constant shifting of names and scenery in the numerous legends about Soma and Indra. Indra is the lord of the moon, then he feeds on the moon like the other gods; at last he is actually represented as swallowing the moon, 'so that the moon is no longer seen either in the East or in the West.' By this process Indra becomes the enemy of the moon, and the moon becomes a kind of demon or Vritra. One of the Brâhmanas says distinctly, 'He who shines there (the sun) that is Indra, the moon is Vritra' (Sat. Br. i. 6, 4, 18). The two

^{*} Hillebrandt, p. 315.

instead of being friends, as elsewhere, are here represented as antagonists. In the same place the sun is said to eat the moon; and when the moon has thus been sucked out, Indra, who is often identified with the sun,* throws it away, so that it vanishes for a time, till it appears again in the West. Hence the frequent expressions that the sun is the devourer, the moon the food; or that Agni is the devourer, and Soma the food. At the bottom of all this there is always the same vague idea that at the time of new moon the moon has entered the sun or has been swallowed by the sun. Some lines of the 'Veda' seem clearly to imply a knowledge on the part of the Vedic poets that the moon derived its light from the sun. Thus we read ('Sâma-v.' ii. 9, 2, 12, 1): 'He clothes himself in succession in the light of the sun.' The moon when waning is supposed to remain invisible for three nights, and that is the very time when the souls of the departed are supposed to enter in. This tradition is kept up till the time of the Puranas. In several of them we read that when only a little is left of the fifteenth part of the moon, the Fathers approach and enter, till the moon grows and becomes full again at the time of full-moon (Hillebrandt, p. 293).

But this is by no means the only explanation of the phases of the moon. Sometimes Soma or the moon is supposed to have been carried off and to be kept prisoner behind iron bars, till he is discovered by a falcon, who brings Soma back to Indra ('Rig-Veda,' viii. 100, 8). In doing this he has to fight the enemies, the Dasyus, who therefore must be supposed to have carried him off and to have kept him prisoner. But here also everything is still vague and varying. Sometimes it seems to be Indra, but slightly disguised, who brings back Soma; sometimes Soma is supposed to have become a bird (ix. 97, 33), and afterwards to have returned to the house of his worshippers

(Hillebrandt, p. 298).

There is one lesson which the study of the mythological cycle of the Soma-legends, as exhibited in Professor Hillebrandt's learned work, should impress on all students of mythology; namely, that the only safe foundation for a truly scientific study of ancient deities is the study of their names and through it the discovery of their original intention. What could we have made of Soma, if we had known the numerous and often contradictory legends only which have been told of him in the Brâhmanas, and many of which are presupposed in the Vedic hymns? What would the ceremonies and festivals, the rites and

^{* &#}x27;Rig-Veda,' viii. 98, 2: 'tvám sûryam arokayah.'

ted as moon : who is that it Hence moon food. e idea sun or ' seem poets e read ession pposed y time This several fteenth moon

ases of o have till he Indra the o have re also ems to some-3), and hippers

-moon

logical randt's ology; e study it the e have en conin the Vedic tes and

usages,

usages, what would the whole sacrificial cult of Soma in India and Persia have taught us about its true nature, unless we had known the original meaning of Soma as moon, and unless we had discovered by means of etymology that the moon was called Soma on account of his pouring down the fertilizing rain on the parched earth? We must not expect too much from etymology. Etymology can do no more than discover the roots from which the names of the gods are derived, and it is well known that the meaning of these roots is mostly very general. The later development of the ancient names of the gods must be studied from later sources. To know, for instance, that Varuna (Ouranos) is derived from a root var, 'to cover,' and meant originally the covering or all-embracing sky, does not help us to a knowledge of all the later fates of this deity, whether in India or in Greece. And it is well known that the same root var yielded in Sanskrit the name Vritra, a demon of darkness, the Greek Orthros. Still etymology gives us the right starting-point, and I doubt whether we should have discovered the red thread that runs through the tangled web of lunar mythology, unless it had been shown that the root su, from which Soma is derived, was the same as the Greek v in vei, and meant 'to rain.' We need not exaggerate the importance of etymology for a truly scientific analysis of ancient myths, but we may truly say that mythology without etymology is like mineralogy without chemistry. Ceremonies, sacrifices, local customs and legends become all very useful if we once know the source from whence the deity whom they concern really sprang. Without that knowledge they are more likely to lead us astray than to lead us into the right way. Suppose we knew all about the careful preparation of the Soma juice, its invigorating and its intoxicating character; suppose we knew that the gods feed on Soma, and that one of them, Indra, got drunk on it; suppose that we knew that Soma was a king and the fabulous ancestor of a royal race, and that he was likewise the creator and ruler of the world, he who stemmed asunder heaven and earth-what should we make of all this chaos without the light that springs from the name of Soma as soon as we know that etymologicallythat is, originally-Soma meant rain and moon? As soon as we know that, nearly every legend told of Soma, every sacrificial custom connected with Soma, falls into its right place. We understand, not perhaps why they must be what they are, but at all events how they could be what they are, and that is really all that an historical study of mythology can be expected to teach us.

ART. VII .- 1. Hospitals and Asylums of the World. By Henry

C. Burdett. London, 1892. 4 vols.

 First, Second, and Third Reports of the Select Committee of the House of Lords of Metropolitan Hospitals, &c. Printed for Her Majesty's Stationery Office. London, 1890, 1891, 1892.

3. Burdett's Hospital Annual for 1893. London, 1893.

 Suffering London. By J. Egmont Hake. London, 1892.
 Cottage Hospitals, General, Fever, and Convalescent; their Progress, Management, and Work. By Henry C. Burdett, Second Edition. London, 1880.

 Pay Hospitals and Paying Wards throughout the World. Facts in Support of a Re-arrangement of the English System of Medical Relief. By Henry C. Burdett. London, 1879.

7. How to Become a Nurse. By Honnor Morten. London, 1892.

T is probable that to England the most lasting bequest received from the Crimean War has been the development of scientific nursing; for although the interest roused by Miss Nightingale and her work was of an ignorant and sentimental nature, Miss Nightingale herself was neither sentimental nor ignorant. She knew that the competent nursing of the sick was not a matter of emotion but of experience; that the most sympathetic feelings are valueless to the suffering until guided by a real comprehension of disease; that the moral qualities which form the basis of success in all philanthropic work require to be supplemented by scientific knowledge and practical Therefore when the British nation, following the characteristic example of that shipwrecked Briton who desired to do some pious work before the sea devoured him, made a collection and presented Florence Nightingale with it, she dedicated the money to the training of nurses for the sick. The emotion which had raised the money followed it, however, to its destination; nurses and hospitals became the object of a new interest, which has made them more important factors in the life of the nation than they ever had been before.

This interest has not been an unmixed good. It has had, as all impulsive movements have, a morbid, a sensational, a foolish side. Every nurse has been made a heroine, taught to regard herself as of a different clay from other working women, infinitely higher, yet not to be asked to accept the saint's duty of sacrifice with the saint's meed of adoration. The New Journalism has made a 'Hospital Scandal' out of every instance in which a patient has been refused the unwholesome diet he craved, or was forbidden the harmless luxury of smoking

Henry ittee of ited for , 1892.

892. ; their surdett.

stem of 9. ondon,

World.

pequest pment y Miss mental tal nor e sick e most guided alities work actical ng the desired nade a it, she sick. wever, ct of a tors in

as had, onal, a taught orking ept the The every lesome noking rank rank tobacco in the ward; the old cry of experimentalizing doctors has been raised with more insistence and with new pathological detail; a fierce light of criticism, not white, but coloured now with the rose of sentiment and the purple of enthusiasm, now with the green of malice and the yellow of slander, has beat upon the hospitals, pointing out indeed many flaws, but on the whole winning an ever-increasing esteem for the medical charities of the land. Under it all, the hospitals have thriven. Not only have they increased in number-in some respects a rather doubtful boon—but they have developed in size and organization. Special hospitals have taught the older and larger establishments, grown somewhat supine through their age and bulk, the need of more careful distinction of disease within their walls; anæsthetics and antiseptics have opened a new world for surgery; improved sanitation, supplemented by that little, fragile, powerful instrument, the clinical thermometer, has eased the course of medicine; our hospitals are, for their good and evil fortune, more popular than ever they were, both with those who support them and those who seek their aid. Where, a generation ago, would the industrious author of 'Hospitals and Asylums of the World' have found readers? How many cared for the institutions to which he has devoted so much research? Would any committee of peers have been appointed half a century ago to inquire into the condition of the metropolitan hospitals? If it had been, how many of the noble lords would have approached the question with the knowledge displayed by those whose report now lies before us? Would they have devoted as much attention to the questions of nurses' food and out-patients' medicines? Would they have been competent, would they even have thought it decorous, to analyse the accounts of a charity like those of a business firm? The questions answer themselves. It is only in comparatively recent times that charity has become a science, and that it has been deemed possible or becoming for a benefactor to do more than give his money, and ask no questions as to what was done with it.

Therefore it is only in these recent days that such a book as Mr. Burdett's 'Hospitals and Asylums of the World' has been made possible. But having realized the possibility, the author has put into these encyclopædic volumes all that is to be said on the subject. Is it hospital history we want? We have it narrated from the first hints of public care for the sick in the books of antiquity. Is the student indifferent to the past? does he seek to know only the hospital world of to-day? He can here compare the working of every system in the world, and judge

for himself how our voluntary hospitals compare with those of countries where the State undertakes the whole duty of looking. after the indigent sick, and those where the Government comes in only to supplement the work of charity. The conundrum which all philanthropists spend their lives in trying to solve, yet seem to leave a riddle at the end,—how to help the poor without demoralizing them,—is not indeed settled in these pages; but they contain a vast amount of material, hitherto unattainable, to help in the solution, so far, at least, as the sick poor are concerned. They condense the information gained in every country of the world where hospitals exist, -information obtained often with no slight difficulty, wrested by main force and endless importunity from officials who, rightly or wrongly, conceived it to be their main duty to conceal all that they knew. Hospital finance with its endless variations and complications is treated in full and clear detail. The statistics are indeed of the highest value; we believe they form the only attempt yet made to give an estimate of the comparative expenditure of various institutions in relation to the work they perform. Nursing in all its branches is as fully treated. The unenlightened aspirant may learn how best to enter the profession, and what will be the duties required of her in every branch of it; while lookers-on may compare the respective advantages of employing members of a religious sisterhood and lay nurses who are under no vow save that of obeying the rules of the institution they enter. The question of pay hospitals and pay wards in voluntary hospitals—a matter not as yet fully appreciated by those who would most profit by their being made more popular-comes under discussion. Hospitals for infectious diseases and poor-law infirmaries, the need for them, their merits and their defects, are dealt with in a fashion only possible to one who has given both thought and study to the subject. On the all-important question of construction, on which it so largely depends whether our hospitals shall be really helps to health or hot-beds of disease, the plates in 'Hospitals and Asylums of the World' form the best, the only complete guide an architect can find. The book is, in fact, encyclopædic, as we have said; it leaves no point untouched in the subject it deals with, - a subject of the widest public interest, of which at the same time the public knows next to nothing. The whole hospital question, as we have it with us now, is so new a thing that only the vaguest ideas of it are common, and its literature has consisted almost entirely of emotional and morbid accounts of the superficial aspects of hospital life—a day in the wards, a visit to the operating theatre.

theatre, or an interview with a nurse, written by some one who possessed the trick of effective journalistic writing, but knew nothing of the hospital in its wider relation to the

community.

hose of

looking.

comes

andrum

lve, yet

without

es; but

inable,

or are

a every

btained

rce and

rongly,

y knew.

mplica-

ics are

ne only

parative

rk they

. The

he pro-

n everv

spective

ood and

he rules

tals and

y appre-

g made

fectious

n, their

on only

y to the

ion, on

hall be

lates in

the only

in fact,

touched

public

next to

with us

of it are

tirely of

pects of

perating

theatre,

Hospitals, as we now understand the term, are of modern growth. True it is, as Mr. Burdett tells us in the historical section of 'Hospitals and Asylums of the World,' that in the records of Egypt and ancient India we find allusions to institutions that foreshadow the hospitals of later times; and even our asylums for sick animals are borrowed from the East. An inscription engraven on a rock near the city of Surat tells how Asoka, a king who reigned in Gujerat in the third century B.C., commanded the establishment of hospitals in all his dominions, and placed one at each of the four gates of the royal city of Patna. Six hundred years after this, Fa-Hian, an intelligent Chinese traveller who visited India in 399 A.D., records that Asoka's hospitals still existed and flourished; but the successive floods of conquest swept all away, and by the beginning of this century only a hospital for animals remained of all the pious king's foundations. Ancient Egyptian records are more vague in their allusions to the treatment of the sick; but it seems likely, from a legend which is given in the Papyrus Ebers, that a clinic existed in connexion with the temple of Heliopolis. It is equally probable that, if the history of the temples of Esculapius could be unveiled, we should find that in them also a hospital supplemented the shrine, and that the sick who offered sacrifices there found something more than 'faithhealing' within their walls. But from none of these are our hospitals derived; they were destroyed and forgotten in the barbarian conquests, and so utter is the oblivion into which they fell that it is now an article of the popular creed that it is to Christianity we owe the first idea of care for the sick and afflicted.

It is certain, indeed, that piety rather than science was the first motive which impelled the foundation of these institutions in Christian times; as it was piety rather than science which placed together under one roof the sick, the aged, the orphaned, and the insane. The care of the inmates was a religious duty, taken up by monks and nuns who primarily were expected to think more of the souls than of the bodies of those under their charge, though in time medicine as well as charity flourished in the cloister wards. But, subjected to no outside control, independent of lay opinion as of lay support, these institutions became the home of many abuses; and Henry VIII., when in his reforming zeal he altered their

constitution, not forgetting to confiscate to himself a large share of their endowments, really helped to place them on a permanently healthy basis; for by this simple process of confiscation, though modified in part by some small re-endowment, he established the modern hospital—the hospital supported by voluntary contributions. The voluntary contribution gives a right of investigation to the contributor, which he may indeed neglect to exercise, but which remains inalienably his, and can be used if any doubt of the destination of his charity should ever arise in his mind. It is true, indeed, that few of those who give their money pay any more heed to the refuges they help to support, that even those who accept election to the office of Governor make it often but a barren honour, and never enter the institution they are supposed to rule. But there are always a few who take a genuine interest in the work, and these form at once a check and an inspiration to the officials. Considering the reasons for which Governors are sometimes appointed, it is not wonderful that their interest is slack. Said the late Dr. Steele, Medical Superintendent of Guy's Hospital, in his evidence before the Lords' Committee on the 8th of May, 1890: 'The oldest existing Governor we have on our Board is the Right Honourable W. E. Gladstone. He was appointed in the year 1833, because at that time the government of the hospital was a very Conservative one, and he was supposed to be the rising hope at that time of the Conservative party.' We have long held that the bestowal of non-political appointments for political reasons was a blunder as well as an injustice, and the above may be regarded as a case in point. Where the dignity of Governor may be purchased by a donation of some considerable amount, the purchaser is inclined to take out his reward in letters of recommendation for patients, which he may or may not distribute judiciously. These letters of recommendation are, more or less, a necessary evil. It has been found that where they are not given annual subscriptions are apt to fall off; yet when subscribers receive this quid pro quo, they often do not know what to do with it. Sometimes a year will pass without their being asked for a letter, in which case, we are informed by one of the authorities of the Hospital for Sick Children in Great Ormond Street, they are inclined to complain, and even to withdraw their subscription. Do they indeed think that their money has been wasted because any one among them has not used his privilege of nominating a patient? They should remember that, if each subscriber used to the full his power of sending patients to the hospital, the wards would soon be overcrowded and the out-patient rooms mobbed. As for the finances ge share permascation, he estavolunright of eglect to used if arise in ve their ort, that or make stitution vho take a check sons for onderful Medical

fore the

existing

nourable

, because

ry Con-

e at that

that the

sons was

regarded

may be

ount, the

etters of

nay not

tion are,

at where

fall off;

often do

will pass

, we are

for Sick

complain,

y indeed

ne among

t? They

full his

ould soon

s for the

finances

Practically, indeed, it is impossible to make the subscriber's letter the all-important thing the subscriber thinks it is. The sick cannot go wandering about looking for recommendations; they betake themselves straight to the hospital, and there they find their need their best supporter. They are admitted because they are ill, not because this or that donor has sent

finances of the institution, it is impossible that they should stand the strain. In some places as many as five letters are given for a guinea, and it is indeed asking too much of hospital officials to demand that they shall treat patients, even taking the in and out departments together, at something less than four and threepence a head. But the subscriber who desires to use his privilege, yet knows no suitable candidate for hospital treatment, need never be at a loss. His clergyman, his doctor, or the secretary of the hospital itself, will be able to distribute his letters of recommendation, and in all probability more judiciously than he can himself.

As a matter of fact the worst fault of the average subscriber is his tendency to distribute letters with too little consideration of the applicants' real need. We speak here of those who really desire to use their privilege honestly, not of those foreseeing persons who give a guinea to the nearest hospital with a view to having any of their servants who may fall ill during the course of the year treated there at a minimum of expense to themselves. The thing is done, and by those whose position and income render such miserliness wholly inexcusable; but fortunately only by comparatively few. But of those who mean honestly and generously, how many forget that the first claim to hospital treatment is proved necessity! Some respectable workman in the receipt of good wages, some shopkeeper who is thriving in a modest way, and is sufficiently economical to desire to avoid a doctor's bill, gets the benefit of their charity; while others, whose need is infinitely greater, knock in vain at the beneficent portals, or would knock in vain if committees and officials, who are in daily contact with the sick poor, were not often wiser than subscribers, and admit an urgent case, though it is recommended by none. We know indeed that both admission and rejection are frequently decided by hasty and imperfect methods, and under the present conditions of hospital administration it can hardly be otherwise; but at the worst the judgment of the official is more likely to be sound than that of the ordinary subscriber, whose circle of selection is as much too small as that of the doctor is too large, and who is needlessly desirous of vicariously getting his money's worth out of the hospital to which he subscribes.

them

them to the door. Different diseases certainly give a different value to subscribers' letters. A consumptive patient can wait a day or two, even a week or two, while a recommendation is obtained, and be little the worse; not so a case of acute pneumonia. With the latter a few hours' delay, a little longer exposure to unhealthy conditions, may mean the difference between life and death. In cancer admission to the hospital a little sooner or a little later may affect the sufferer's comfort, but hardly his life; in peritonitis delay may be of the utmost danger. In serious cases no hospital official dare stand on ceremony. With accidents and with many forms of disease there can be only one question asked—'Is there room?' If that be answered in the affirmative, admission must and will be granted as freely to the friendless as to the most influentially supported.

The majority of subscribers are donors, pure and simple. They may do their utmost to fill the wards of the hospital; but they do not often interfere in its administration, even when the amount they add to its funds gives them the right to do so. Like constitutional monarchs, they reign but do not govern, and a large majority of them are rois fainéants except at the

moment when they sign their cheque for the charity.

The management of a hospital falls practically into the hands of a very few governors, who constitute, formally or informally, a weekly or monthly board, and it is to these that the officials make their report; it is they who criticise and suggest, who approve or condemn new methods, who point out the necessity for changes and improvements, while the sleeping governors, as they may be called, give a formal and unthinking sanction to the recommendations of the smaller body. Occasionally indeed they refuse to do so; and it is a grievance of those who take an active interest in an institution that they are liable to be swamped and over-ridden at any time by the great body of governors choosing to vote upon questions to which they have given little consideration, and upon which they are not really competent to decide, from lack of close knowledge of the conditions through which they have been raised. When it is stated that the London Hospital has no fewer than 4,000 governors, or, speaking roughly, five governors to every bed, it seems clear that the parliament is too large for the nation; yet, as each governor represents a donation of thirty guineas, it is probable that the authorities would rather increase than diminish their number. The house committee, to whom the practical management is delegated, numbers thirty, and the average attendance is eleven. These are the true rulers,-the Cabinet,

so to speak,—liable, however, like other governments, to be lifferent overthrown by a vote of censure by the larger body. That wait a the mass of governors sometimes indulge in vexatious interation is e pneuference is not to be denied. Some half-comprehended parrotlonger cry, some trivial but loudly proclaimed and endlessly reiterated private grievance, rouses them from their indifference, fference and they come out to condemn officials and voluntary workers spital a of whose anxieties and labours they have only the vaguest comfort, notion. On the other hand, there are some who will hardly be utmost persuaded to attend meetings at all. No matter how important and on the question at issue may be, they will not inform themselves disease upon it; and can be driven to record a vote only by the endless n?' If importuning of those who are practically the 'whips' of one will be party or the other. It is hardly to be supposed that such men, entially even when driven to the board-room, will have given much thought to the subject to be discussed; and hospital politics, simple, al; but like those of larger bodies, suffer often from the action of an indifferent and ignorant majority. Yet the existence of some n when large body of governors is necessary and desirable, although, o do so. like other forms of popular government, it is occasionally foolish ern, and and annoying in its manifestations. For small committees are at the apt to fall into one of two opposed errors. Sometimes, and perhaps more frequently, they become too subservient to the e hands permanent officials, and obstinately support them, right or ormally, wrong; or, on the other hand, they develop a spirit of restlessofficials ness and suspicion, which makes any continuity of policy imest, who possible, and keeps all with whom they have to do in a state

ecessity

rnors, as

ction to

y indeed

take an

e to be

body of

ey have

ot really

the con-

en it is

0 gover-

it seems

yet, as

as, it is

liminish

practical

average Cabinet, operates for good.

Medical men do not always belong to these weekly boards or house committees, and occasionally they form a medical committee by themselves. It might therefore be said that in such cases they have no share in the administration of the hospital. Nevertheless it is clear that their influence must be an essential point of the first importance. The effect of a doctor's wishes, even his caprices, on the management and expenditure of a hospital, is almost incalculable. Hospitals exist for the patients, and who but the doctor can say what the patients require? There is no doubt that some hospital physicians and surgeons abuse their unquestioned power. Some margin for the cost of experiments must be allowed, since it is admitted that one of the secondary uses of hospitals is the development of medical knowledge. Especially where a school exists in connexion with the hospital

of perpetual irritation. To neither of these extremes is the

criticism of a larger body a direct check; but by raising

discussion and promoting inquiry, it generally, in the end,

some expenditure must be permitted for demonstration purposes; a medical school is often a direct source of income, and always one indirectly, for the students as a rule interest their friends in the institution they study at, and bring to it contributions it would not otherwise have received. But, making every allowance for these permissible outlays, it must be admitted that the medical men occasionally involve their hospital in needless extravagance. Not a few, out of sheer good nature, or a desire for popularity in the wards, order for their patients dainties which they do not absolutely need. It seems an ungracious task to grudge anything to the sick and suffering, and where private charity chooses to lavish luxuries on its pet objects no one would interfere; but it is a different question when a man eases his own soul by a generous distribution of other people's money. If only five people are fed upon a sum that would have maintained six, a wrong is done, for it may be taken for granted that every subscriber wishes his contribution, however small it be, to help as many people as possible, and he has a right to feel assured that this is done. The food of a hospital in-patient costs (according to Mr. Ryan, the Secretary to St. Mary's Hospital, Paddington, who was specially complimented by the Lords' Committee on the careful and minute way in which his accounts were kept) 1s. 2d, to 1s. 3d. a day. This sum is enough to provide each member of even a small household with simple, but nourishing and sufficient food; and, with the greater advantage a large institution has in making contracts, it has proved enough for any absolutely necessary delicacies of invalid's fare. But it obviously will not do more, nor should more be expected. If a patient is not contented with the food which can be given at this rate, one of two things may be inferred, -either that he is not of the class for whom free medical relief was intended, or that he is one of those confirmed grumblers who are to be found in every station of life, and, as is well known, it is often those who fare most hardly at home who are most difficult to please in hospital.

In drugs, too, and in surgical appliances much extravagance is occasionally to be met with. Sometimes it is a nurse who uses a piece of lint by way of a duster; but the most frequent offender is the young resident physician or surgeon. He reads the advertisement pages of the medical journals, and covets all he sees therein. Things innumerable are tried and found wanting, or are pushed aside to make room for some newer invention. The open-handedness of the newly-qualified young doctor must be a thorn in the side of an economical secretary, who yet can do little to check it. The difference between one

urposes; d always iends in it would rance for medical vagance. pularity y do not dge anyy chooses fere; but oul by a only five ed six, a very subhelp as ured that ccording ddington, nittee on ere kept) ride each ourishing a large ough for . But it ted. If a given at that he is ended, or be found

ravagance nurse who t frequent He reads covets all nd found me newer fied young secretary, tween one man's

ten those

to please

man's views of what is necessary for a patient and those of another is best seen in a moderate-sized provincial hospital, where the resident doctor has more control than in most metropolitan institutions, and where, as he usually stays for some years, he learns wisdom with increasing age. In these places, according to Mr. Burdett, the appointment of a new resident may mean an increase of from 2001. to 3001. to the hospital expenditure in the first year of his charge. The honorary staff sin also in this respect, though less grievously. In the Edinburgh Royal Infirmary an ingenious moral check is put to medical extravagance. The cost per month of each doctor's patients is recorded in a special book which all the staff may read. Each man has there the opportunity of comparing his expenditure with that of his colleagues, and thus arises a wholesome emulation in economy. The result is that while the average cost per occupied bed in the Edinburgh Infirmary is (according to the elaborate and carefully drawn out tables in 'Hospitals and Asylums of the World') 52l. 14s. 4d. per annum, the cost at the London Hospital, which is nearest in size (the number of beds in the latter is 781 as against 690 in the former; but the average of occupied beds is almost the same-635 in the London, 634 in Edinburgh), is 74l. 1s. 1d. : and the London is, save one, the Westminster Hospital, the most cheaply conducted of any metropolitan hospital with a medical school attached. On the vexed and difficult question of computing expenses by means of the cost per occupied bed, we intend, however, to say more in dealing with hospital accounts.

The ultimate decision as to who are suitable persons to receive free medical relief, as in-patients or out-patients, rests with the doctors, but only with regard to the applicant's disease. Before reaching this tribunal he must run the gauntlet of the other officials who are detailed to inquire, as sharply as they can in the limited time at their command, as to his social and financial claims to the aid he seeks. How difficult it is to decide this question fairly only those who have tried to do so can surmise. Hospitals were founded for the benefit of the sick poor, but of whom, in these days, do the sick poor consist? When most of these institutions began their work there was no legal provision for the sick, and all who could not pay for a doctor went to the hospital. But now that the Poor-law infirmaries absorb many of these cases, especially chronic diseases, the hospital patient is supposed to be one who, while able to support himself and his family when in health, cannot afford the expense of medical attendance, nursing, and invalid diet when ill. But this definition is 2 1 Vol. 177.—No. 354.

vague in the extreme. Who is there among us to whom the expense of illness in our family is not a more or less serious consideration? Yet we pay our doctors-grudgingly, it may be, with the ingratitude of one who has received no new gift, but only had an old possession restored—but we pay them. Among those who arrogate to themselves the title of the working classes we find also that families whose incomes and responsibilities are identical vary so much in providence that where one has a sufficiency laid by for a rainy day, another is practically destitute. Are we then to put a premium on improvidence by giving to the latter, without the stigma of pauperism which belongs to the Poor-law infirmary, a help which we refuse to the former? As a matter of fact both are admitted to the benefits of the hospital, and general practitioners cry out that patients who could perfectly afford to pay their fees go to the hospitals and are treated gratuitously. It is certain that doctors do not thrive where hospitals abound, and it seems evident that if all who receive free medical relief are hopelessly unable to pay for it, there are districts, at least in the metropolis, which must be on the verge of general bankruptcy. Take the evidence given by Lieut.-Col. Montefiore with regard to the district of Marylebone, which cannot be regarded as one of the poorest in London :-

'The parish of Marylebone: area, 1506 acres; population, 155,004. This area contains one general hospital with school, viz. the Middlesex Hospital; ten special hospitals—one for women, one for women and children, a lying-in hospital, a hospital for diseases of the chest and throat, a dental hospital, an ophthalmic hospital, two hospitals for paralysis and epilepsy, two orthopædic hospitals; four free dispensaries, and one provident dispensary, besides one or two medical charities for gentlewomen in temporary illness, &c. There is also Poor-law infirmary and two Poor-law dispensaries. From the reports of these institutions it would appear that, in the year 1885, 108,751 people were treated at eleven hospitals, six of which are free and five receive payment; 7,567 at three free dispensaries; 3,203 at one provident dispensary; and 7,809 by the two Poor-law dispensaries: but deducting 10 per cent. for recurrent cases, we get 7,731 patients; number treated at the infirmary being certainly considerably over 1100. We find thus that the following numbers received gratuitous treatment:—64,516 from six free hospitals; 7,567 from three free dispensaries; and 7,731 from the Poor-law, making a total of 79,814; that is, exclusive of the 1100 at the Poor-law infirmaries.' (Report from the Select Committee of the House of Lords, Session 1890, p. 18.)

We will not assume from this statement that half the inhabitants of Marylebone are practically paupers, for in the special om the

serious

it may

new gift,

y them.

of the

mes and

nce that

nother is

on im-

igma of

a help

both are

titioners

heir fees

s certain

it seems

pelessly

etropolis,

Take the

d to the

ne of the

, 155,004.

Middle-

the chest

spitals for

free dis-

o medical

e is also a

he reports

, 108,751

e and five

03 at one w dispen-

s, we get

ainly con-

numbers

als; 7,567

making a

Poor-law

House of

f the in-

special

special hospitals and in the cancer wards of the Middlesex Hospital would be found patients from outside the parish boundaries; but it is safe to say that the proportion of the population that seeks and accepts free medical treatment is unduly, shamefully large. Where no such hospital facilities exist, people in the same rank and with the same income manage to pay their doctor, but the temptation to get something for nothing is too great for many people who cannot be classed as poor. It might be an extreme case that was told in evidence by Dr. Alderson, but it is a shame that, even as a rare exception, such a misappropriation of charitable funds should be possible. The facts are as follow: *-A youth, son of a wholesale tea-merchant who shortly afterwards retired with a competency, was suffering from stone in the bladder. The father consulted Dr. Alderson, who advised an operation and recommended a certain surgeon. The advice was accepted, but on the following day some demur was made as to the operation being performed at home on the score of the difficulty of procuring sufficiently good nursing. Dr. Alderson then advised that the patient should go to the West London Hospital, where the same surgeon could operate. But the tea-merchant preferred to send his son as a free patient to St. Peter's Hospital for Stone, Covent Garden (a seemingly extravagant institution, it may be remarked, where the cost per occupied bed reaches 2851. per annum). We may hope that the father made a donation to the hospital by which he profited-it would be interesting to know if he did-but this would be small consolation to the surgeon, who may justly regard himself as having been 'done' out of a fee which the patient's parents were perfectly able to pay. The fact that the income of this hospital shows, according to Burdett's 'Hospital Annual for 1893,' a deficit of about 400l., though it has only 26 beds, does not make such a case of careless admission more excusable.

The responsibility of admitting such cases largely falls upon the doctors. If a patient's disease is suitable for hospital treatment—that is, if it is acute and non-infectious, still more if it is also curious, and, in the case of a hospital with a medical school, if it is available for clinical demonstration—he is admitted with very little question. The committees of many hospitals indeed try to keep out those who are able to pay for treatment, but it is no easy task. If any one appears whose dress and appearance suggest superior means, a question as to

^{*} Report of the Select Committee of the House of Lords, Session 1891, March 5, 1891, p. 307.

2 1 2 the

the family earnings is asked, and the claimant may be sent away. It is a house surgeon or senior student to whom is often allotted the task of thus separating the sheep from the goats, and in the haste with which the selection must be made it is easy to believe that many a wrong must be inflicted on those, often the most deserving and self-respecting, who instinctively show the best side they can to the world; while their opposites soon learn the trick of coming to the hospital in their shabbiest clothes. Occasionally in some hospitals a discretionary power of selection has been left to a porter or janitor, and this has too often resulted in bribery and consequent unjust favouritism. Nor can any commendation be bestowed on the method of demanding a small fee from each out-patient for registration. doubtedly brings in a little money to the hospital, which is one desideratum, and limits the number of out-patients, which is very generally another; but who are they whom it excludes? Are they not those who have the best right to be admitted, but to whom the payment of a shilling, of even threepence, is a matter of consideration while they are still uncertain that the hospital can do them good? To take a typical contrast quoted in 'Pay Hospitals of the World,' it is a very different matter for a half-starved widow, trying to bring up her children respectably on, at most, thirteen shillings and sixpence a week, and suffering from cancer, to pay a shilling fee for registration, from what the same registration fee represents when demanded from a youth of eighteen who has only himself to keep out of a wage of nineteen shillings a week, and whose disease is the direct result of vicious indulgence. A method of restraining overcrowding which results in such abuse as this, is wholly unworthy of the hospitals of Britain. Nor can much be said for the rough-and-ready method of admitting to the waitingroom only a fixed number of applicants per day. Some of the unsuitable may be kept away by the chance of non-admission; but on the other hand many go, day after day, to their Bethesda, to find that others have stepped in before them, until a disease which at first was curable assumes, through neglect, a fatal aspect. We say nothing of the long hours of waiting after admission before the doctor in attendance can inspect all the candidates, because it is not easy to see that this could be avoided, though unfortunately it facilitates the transmission of infectious disease, brought to the hospital in ignorance of its true nature. But something should be done to prevent every sneak and miser, who may choose to seek it, getting hospital treatment gratis. In some hospitals—the Hospital for Children in Great Ormond Street, for example—inquiries are made in

tl

0

he

ne

m

an

m

fee

every suspicious case; and where treatment can possibly be delayed, the doctor examines, but does not prescribe, until the applicant's poverty is established. This, it seems to us, might be done everywhere. It would cost the hospital the moderate salary of an investigating officer, but this would, we believe, be recouped in the saving effected by the rejection of undeserving cases, and the moral effect of such investigations, though indirect, would be more valuable still. The unworthy would be scared off by the certainty that inquiry would be made, and thus more room would be left for those who merited help, while the congestion in our hospital waiting-rooms, with all its

attendant evils, would be considerably relieved.

It would help in some degree if medicine were not given gratuitously as well as advice. A hospital might legitimately charge a small sum for an out-patient's medicine; there would be hardly any who could not afford to pay a few pence for their mixture or ointment; while the thought of even threepence or sixpence to be expended would act as a deterrent to some of the unworthy. There are people blessed with a peculiar form of pride, who would take all for nothing; but who, if they cannot get the medicine thrown in with the advice-on which latter, indeed, they set small store-will indulge in the vanity of a private practitioner of some kind, though it is likely enough to be a chemist rather than a doctor. In some respects the chemist suits them better. He is sure to prescribe a dose of one sort or another, and he does not insult those who seek him with those suggestions as to the value of cleanliness, temperance, and fresh air, which so many of the ignorant resent as the utmost impertinence on the part of the hospital doctor. Not that this would dispose of all the plagues of the out-patient room. There are some who have acquired what may be defined as the hospital habit, and go to a new hospital when they are sent away from the last with an endless, trivial complaint. They are of the type usually associated with testimonials to quack medicines, but they have not yet discovered the fountain of health in any of those popular decoctions of aloes whose bitterness is the supreme proof of their value. They are as yet only making their pilgrimage to that sentence in their statement which declares that 'the doctors could do nothing for them,' and more than hints that 'the doctors' did not understand the mysterious complaint. In truth the doctors understand it perfectly. If these applicants were richer, they might be regarded by a needy practitioner as being, in some respects, not undesirable patients; but when they come to take up, with their long-winded accounts of contradictory symptoms, the time of

an over-busy man, and to sponge on the provisions of charity, they are an unmitigated nuisance. They are not all, perhaps, in perfect health; but having a natural tendency to hypochondria, they become anxious about themselves over some trifling ailment which their betters would carry about through a long life without thinking of it. A 'stitch in the side' left by some long-past pleurisy; an indigestion which could be cured by greater carefulness in food -the last remedy they will think of employing-these are the complaints they bring to the hospital; and when the physician tells them the plain truth about themselves, they go about the world with complaints of brutality, indifference to suffering, and every other accusation which disappointed vanity—the vanity of the would-be invalid is of the most sensitive and resentful kind!—can bring against the hospital and all connected with it. Sometimes they have not even the delusion of a disease; they come to the hospital, as other people go periodically to the dentist, to make sure that they are well, or, by preference, to have the doctor tap and sound and test in the hope that he will find something wrong with them. They will even come to ask for some specific, some elixir vitæ to prevent their falling ill. A relic or a charm would do; a vigorously expressed opinion and a prompt dismissal are the best substitutes available, and a reputation for 'standing no nonsense' is not the least important qualification for a hospital doctor.

h

n

b

81

SI

n

fe

r

cl

al

P

ir

P

ath

th

in

th

CO

ar

ot

is

re

ar

Many of these people are technically to be classed as poor; it is not their income that renders them ineligible for hospital treatment. In fact the money test alone will not settle the question of fitness, however essential it may be to the decision. A wage-limit may be desirable, but to judge from that alone, without reference to the number to be supported out of that wage, their position and needs, would be obviously unreasonable. Indeed we have to face the fact that it is not always those who are generally labelled 'the poor' who need most the help of medical charity. A struggling tradesman, a clerk whose limited salary is yet expected to keep him in all the outward marks of conventional middle-class respectability, a clergyman whose income seems to be designed to maintain him in more than apostolic poverty,-these and the like are often infinitely less able to pay a doctor's bill than the average artisan; and it is desirable that, in judging of the merits of a case, the relative income of the head of the family as proportioned to his position, and the demands made on it, should be considered, as well as its absolute amount. It is for cases of this kind that subscribers' letters are most to be desired. The modestly proud and

and reticent, practically though not avowedly poor, will appeal less reluctantly for the aid they need if their demand is fortified by the recommendation of a subscriber; but, without a friendly hand to open the door for them, they suffer in silence, dispensing entirely with help, or taking only the most meagre attendance possible from the cheapest doctor they know, because

'to beg they are ashamed.'

Such cases as these lead up to another class who need hospital accommodation and are as yet very ill-provided with it. In every large town there are those who do not dare to be ill at home. In the case of infectious disease it is better even for members of a family to be removed to a hospital. They must be isolated in any case, so the ordinary clinging of affection is strained to the feeblest thread; and it is infinitely better to snap it at once when by so doing the risk of infection can be minimised, almost annihilated. In any case it is a hard choice for wife or mother to make, when she is called on to decide whether the higher duty calls her to shut herself up in the sickroom or to resolve never to enter it. Whatever part she may choose, every sound from the forbidden side of the house is an anxiety, a strain on her nerves, and the end is often that prudence and common-sense give way before unreasoning affection, and the nurse becomes the ready transmitter of infection from the sick to the sound. The best intended, even the most conscientiously fulfilled isolation of an infectious patient in a private house is too often incomplete. The average city dwelling was never built for emergencies such as these, and in a large family the overcrowding in one part of the members who are well, to leave a sufficiency of space between them and the one who is ill, is in itself unhealthy as well as inconvenient. Decidedly, removal to a special establishment is the best in all cases of infectious disease; but it is useless to press this point until all our infectious hospitals have paywards attached, where for a reasonable sum patients may have, besides the ordinary necessaries of attendance and nursing, the comforts they are accustomed to in their daily life.

Similarly in severe surgical cases, in those operations which anæsthetics have made possible, but which they cannot render otherwise than dangerous to the last degree, the complete isolation of a private ward in a hospital, absolute withdrawal from any chance of household noises reaching the patient's ears, removal from even the troubled looks, the whispered words of anxious affection, may be an absolutely necessary condition of recovery. The trained nurse brought into the house may, and often does, command and obtain for the sufferer the needed

silence and repose; but in how many households can she do so without arousing a jealousy and ill-will which, often detailed in words after her departure by those who have employed her, calumniate and sometimes injure a woman who has performed a hard duty, and found it made none the lighter by her patient's friends? Save in the most exceptional circumstances, a private ward or a private hospital is the proper place for such a case.

But, apart from these, there are others who, from no special peculiarity in their disease, but from the fashion in which they live, would be better in hospital when they are ill. To be ill in lodgings! Even the slightest ailment, a headache or a simple cold, seems aggravated by the loneliness, the neglect, enlivened only by the selfish anxiety of a landlady, who is troubled for her own sake, not for yours, lest your disease prove dangerous or 'catching.' She dreads, not your death, but a sauve qui peut of her other lodgers if your illness takes a serious turn; accusations launched against her drains, suggestions of draughty rooms, slanders whispered about her cookery, any one of the hundred explanations of your breakdown which may react unfavourably on her property. Even if she be kindly disposed, she has no time to attend to an invalid, whose very weakness and inability to utter his complaints in sufficiently strident tones put him at a disadvantage compared with those who can order and protest and scold with all the power of healthy lungs and unruffled nerves. To bring a nurse to the house-but that is like putting straw before the door, or in any other way advertising to the world that there is sickness within; and the prosperity of the establishment is again endangered! No, the man who falls ill in lodgings must recover by means of the vis medicatrix naturæ, with little help from art or care; or, failing this, turn out within twenty-four hours of his end that the house may be spared the scandal of a funeral. For the lodging-house is greater than he, and no landlady who desires to succeed in her vocation dare let humanity overrule self-interest.

However much the comfort of a lodger may vary when he is in health, according to the length of his purse, there is comparative similarity in his treatment when he is ill. Even if all needful tendance be given, it is in such a perfunctory fashion as to leave unsoothed the depressing, irritating feeling that he is a nuisance to those around him,—a feeling which, puerile as it is, may have a retarding effect on his recovery. Infinitely different is the feeling of a patient in a hospital ward. There sickness gives the right of entry and ensures the warmest

welcome

welcome and the tenderest care. The patient is a guest, honoured and cherished; not only does he receive the best of attendance and nursing, but all is given in a spirit of kindness which cheers and strengthens him. At present this is almost exclusively the privilege of the poor; or, to be more accurate, it must be accepted as a charity whether the recipient be needy or not; but there is no essential reason why those who are able to pay for their treatment should be worse off than their poorer or less proud neighbours. In Scandinavia the thing has been found practicable. There indeed every patient is a paying one, so far, at least, as the hospital is concerned. The Government pays a small sum for the indigent; others are charged according to the degree of privacy and the quality of food, &c., they demand. Why can a similar system not be introduced into Britain? Why must those patients who cannot, for one reason or another, be treated at their homes, be forced to choose between the acceptance of absolute charity, and going to one of our few pay hospitals, which are usually private ventures demanding prohibitively high terms, and deserving to be called medical lodgings rather than hospitals? In many institutions we see wards closed for lack of funds; why cannot these be opened for the reception of patients who would add a modest sum to the hospital exchequer, or who at least would cause it no loss?

The real difficulty lies in the attitude of the senior medical staff of our hospitals. The appointments of these gentlemen are honorary; they give their time and skill gratuitously to the sick poor, and the fact that they do so confers on them a prestige which causes these unremunerative appointments to be eagerly sought. But it is obviously unfair that they should give gratuitous attendance to those who are able to pay, and in fact are paying the hospital they are in for all the benefits it offers them. To do this is to make a gift of time and skill, both having a money value, either to the patient or to the hospital, which under the circumstances it is not just that either should receive. This non-payment of doctors is one of the flaws of the American pay-hospital system, and vitiates all inferences that may be drawn from its apparent success as an aid to hospital income. Yet for the hospital physician to accept payment, either in the form of fees or of an annual salary, is to alter entirely his relation to the institution, and put itso at least the majority seem to think-on a lower and less honourable basis. Moreover it brings the hospital doctor, with his acknowledged advantage of position, into unfair competition with the ordinary general practitioner, who already complains that the hospitals take patients from him who can perfectly afford afford to pay his fees. Should it then be permitted for the ordinary practitioner to send his patients to a hospital and attend them there? To this the hospital physician objects. To make the hospital the hunting-ground of all and sundry, instead of only a chosen few, is again to derogate from that dignity which makes it worth a man's while to state on the title-page of books, or on any public occasion, that he is one of the physicians or surgeons to such-and-such a hospital. A position on the staff of a hospital is held, rightly or wrongly, to imply in a doctor a certain distinction in his work,—an acknowledged status, which, as it is neither won nor retained without both talent and hard work, he does not care to lower by sharing it with every private practitioner who simply sends a patient to the hospital and, as a private practitioner, attends him there.

So for the present the matter stands at a dead-lock. But thus it cannot long remain. The demand for pay-beds and pay-wards is steadily becoming louder and more distinct. Special hospitals, such as ophthalmic and those for the diseases of women, where the plea of facilities for special treatment can most feasibly be entertained, show the greatest readiness to respond; but it is to be hoped that the general hospitals, mindful that their first duty is to the community, will soon make some arrangement by which all who need the accommodation they afford shall obtain it on fair terms, neither pauperising the one party to the arrangement, nor defrauding the other. If the medical staff still continue to object, it will then be the duty of governors and officials to inquire if it is indeed only for the honour of their position that these gentlemen are so sensitive, or if they are actuated by the more sordid consideration that the prestige they obtain by their connexion with the charity is translated into higher fees outside the hospital walls, and shape their course accordingly.

But one thing doctors and governors alike have a right to demand,—that the paying patient really does pay; that he does not salve his self-respect by giving a few pence for what cannot honestly, and with justice to others, be bought for the money. If payment is to be made, let it be sufficient to cover expense—and expense will include a moderate charge for lodging in the hospital as well as the actual cost of medical attendance, food, and nursing. Whoever cannot give this is a recipient of charity, and if this be so let him know it,—let the charity be open, not disguised. The ignoring of this law of common truthfulness and honesty is the flaw in the so-called provident department established—in the honest intention to

restrict

restrict hospital benefits to those whose circumstances justify their bestowal-by Sir Edmund Hay Currie at the Metropolitan Hospital in Kingsland Road. There, any one whose weekly earnings are not more than a guinea a week, or whose income when supplemented by his family does not exceed thirty-five shillings, can, by paying an entrance fee of sixpence and a subscription of a penny a week, be received as an out-patient at the hospital, and can also obtain home attendance at the rate of sixpence a visit. These fees are said to cover expenses; but in face of a deficit of 2,300l. in last year's income, one cannot help doubting the statement. Even if it be true, it means that this hospital, by the aid of a large unpaid medical staff, can successfully compete with the general practitioners of the neighbourhood, who have to earn their living. These provident members practically receive their treatment at less than cost price, and meanwhile flatter themselves that they are paying for it in full. It is all but impossible to make the poor realize that when they are paying at all they are not paying full price; and we believe that a hospital of this kind will, by the very salve it gives to self-respect, react more unfavourably on the fees of the doctors of the neighbourhood than an avowed and downright charity. The genuine, self-supporting, provident hospital or dispensary is one thing; the semi-provident institution which asks for subscriptions, and is continually in debt, should not be placed in the same category.

Debt! one gets weary of the endless repetition of the word in reading hospital reports! It seems the strangest accident when income and expenditure balance for a year, and indeed it is too often managed only by the thriftless method of treating legacies as revenue, spending them as they come, and trusting to annual windfalls to keep the ball moving. But on the other hand the year's legacies sometimes get hidden away in a special account, are reckoned as neither capital nor income, by secretaries who find that it pays to 'make a poor mouth' to their subscribers.

One cannot altogether blame them, since to plead poverty with the unwearying persistence of the importunate widow of Scripture is one of the few ways open to them of raising money. It is easy to be sarcastic, and say that hospitals, like churches, seem to thrive on their debts; easy to condemn bazaars, festival dinners, and other methods by which money may be lured from half-unwilling hands; but would it be more creditable to sink quietly out of existence, leaving a great and noble work to be neglected, because it is so hard to make the claims of the hospital heard among the noisy demands which besiege the charitable public? Hospitals stand at a disadvantage compared with

many other charities. Their work is silent, and those who profit by them are not of those who can support them. They cannot make a parade of their inmates, with flags and processions, and meetings in Exeter Hall, as almshouses and orphanages do; they do not appeal to the imagination of the thoughtlessly generous by promises of beneficent revolutions to be accomplished in the twinkling of an eye. You must visit them to see their work, and the giver likes to be sought, not to seek, to be entreated, to be hunted down, before he will be

persuaded to give.

A new hospital, the building of a new wing, the fame of a new method in treatment, or the association with the institution of the name of a popular physician or clever surgeon, brings with it a certain amount of enthusiasm. Donations are more readily given, annual subscriptions—the backbone of charities -more willingly promised at such a time. But the heat of generosity dies away, and the struggle for existence begins. As the original subscribers die off, it becomes ever more and more difficult to obtain new ones. The special interest in the institution has died away, and a score of other interests have arisen-new plans for redeeming the world more in consonance with the aspirations and ideals of the new generation. What is it to put an injured man on his legs again, to prolong a few lives, to restore sickly children to health, if you cannot also undertake to change the conditions from which the illness sprang? Here, for example, is General Booth, who promises salvation to body and soul. 'If we give money to him,' people might say, 'we are promised that in return poverty and crime will vanish from the land; the crooked places shall be made straight and the rough places plain: if he succeeds, there will be little work left for the hospitals to do.' And so the hospitals starve while the 'General' gets his hundred thousand pounds, only to find, like other enthusiasts, that it is less easy to gather grapes from thorns than he had supposed. The hospital, even the workhouse and the gaol, have not yet been driven out of existence to the triumphant strains of the Salvation Army band.

Every new claim on charity is a loss to the older institutions. Lately we have seen a very large sum raised within a week or two for the sufferers by the loss of the 'Victoria.' The royal bride shared her wedding gifts with the fund, and sailors contributed their pence for the benefit of their comrades' widows; all classes, gentle and simple, hastened to show, in the only manner left to them, their sorrow for the great disaster. Such impulses are not lightly to be despised. They show that England is a nation yet, with national sympathies and national ideals;

ideals; a united empire, not a mere collection of parishes; and the knowledge that it is so can hardly be bought too dear. But such knowledge must be paid for paid for in terms of cash, as well as in loss of life. The individuals who compose the nation have, as a rule, only a fixed sum to give away each year after all their ordinary expenses are provided for. It may be much or little, but it is not, as a rule, in any degree elastic. If, then, they are impelled to give to some exceptional object, of which the 'Victoria' fund may be taken as the most recent and conspicuous example, they will have less to bestow on the charities which they habitually support. At the time they give to the new demand they are unconscious of this; the glow of enthusiasm carries them away; they do not stop to consider that Peter may be poorer if Paul is enriched, or they may even intend to cut short some accustomed indulgence to make up the deficit. But this feat is more often contemplated than accomplished; and by the time the collectors for mission, church, or hospital come a-begging, the generous and impulsive donor of a few months ago finds that his ordinary subscription to those charities which have come to rely on him must either be diminished or

It is possible—at least the suggestion has been made—that the hospitals find themselves the poorer for a certain effort that is intended to add to their resources. The Hospital Sunday Fund has succeeded in drawing something from people who would be persuaded to give in no other way. It may be that the offering sometimes does not exceed that modest coin which a humorist has declared to be 'the chosen expression of a congregation's gratitude'; but one would not be unthankful, even for threepenny-bits. The feeling that mars our appreciation is the suspicion that there are many people who would, under pressure perhaps, give more to some particular institution, but who salve their consciences for the year by slipping half-a-crown or half-a-sovereign into the offertory bag. 'I give to the Hospital Sunday Fund,' is a convenient answer to importunate collectors and secretaries, who cannot, after all, retort by asking, 'How much?'

Yet the 40,000l. or more which is annually raised by the Fund for the metropolitan hospitals is too big, and, on the whole, too sure a bird in hand to be lightly released, at least without fuller assurance that it in other ways diminishes their revenues than we at present possess; and since the meeting of the Lords' Commission, the Council of the Hospital Sunday Fund have taken one step which should be welcome to all well-wishers of hospitals. We mean their drawing-up, with

the aid of hospital secretaries, the uniform system of account-keeping which all institutions which desire to participate in the Fund must adopt. The form is admirably clear and minute; it shows at a glance under what head every expense should be reckoned, and enables officials to compare their expenditure with that of their neighbours in a way that was practically impossible before. The London hospitals now have their accounts put on a business-like footing; it is to be hoped that before long the uniform system will be adopted in the provinces. None but those who have wrestled with the financial pages in hospital reports in the endeavour to form a comparative estimate of the economy or extravagance of the various

institutions, can realize how necessary this is.

Hardly two institutions keep their accounts alike. Items which are included in the cost of maintenance in one are reckoned as expenses of management in another; endless variations of method occur, and it is only by analysing accounts to the minutest detail that any basis of comparison can be found. Take the popular reckoning of the cost per occupied bed. This does not mean, as to the uninitiated it might seem to do, simply the cost of the food and medicine consumed by the patients who have occupied a bed during the course of the year. It includes besides this their, or rather the bed's, share of the cost of nursing, of every salary in the place, of repairs, furnishing, wear and tear, and the rating of the hospital. This last item varies according to the sweet will of parishes and vestries, which sometimes prove themselves generous, sometimes the reverse. St. Bartholomew's Hospital, which occupies the whole parish of St. Bartholomewthe-Less, naturally pays itself no rates; and as it is a fully endowed institution, it is in every way sufficient unto itself, but none of its fellows is so fortunate. But the rating varies marvellously. Mr. Conrad Thies, Secretary of the Royal Free Hospital, gave some curious examples of this in his evidence:-

'Pray do.—Take, for instance, St. Thomas's Hospital opposite, which

^{&#}x27;We are assessed at the present time at 500l. I may mention that two years since I made an application to the St. Pancras Vestry to consider our assessment. We were assessed at 800l., and I thought, comparing that sum with what I knew to be the assessment of similar institutions in the parish, we were over-assessed. I made a special appeal to the vestry on the subject, and they reduced our assessment from 800l. gross to 500l. gross. We pay upon 431l. net. I may say that at that time I found that the assessment of the hospitals of London, which I inquired into right through, was of the most extraordinary character; I do not know whether you would wish me to say what it was.

which was paying something like 2,500l. a year, speaking from

memory.

*2,3001.?—The London Hospital covers quite as large a space of ground, and was paying 511. a year. And this is simply a specimen of what I found to be the case. The National Hospital in Queen Square, within a half-mile of us, was paying about five times as much, I think, as we were paying, because it was in a different district; it is in Holborn, and the vestry of Holborn make the hospitals pay much more in their district than in St. Paneras Vestry, in which we happen to be.

How much would that sum be, about five times more than you were paying?—They would be assessed at about 2,000l.' (Report,

Session 1891, March 5, 1891, p. 292.)

It is impossible that with such a difference in the rating St. Thomas's Hospital can be worked as cheaply, in proportion, as the London; and in the endlessly varying rates we meet with, it is difficult, it is well-nigh impossible, to say where extra cost implies extravagance. For our own part, we think that hospitals (with the exception, of course, of those institutions which exist only for the benefit of some not too scrupulous physician) might justly claim to escape parish rates entirely. They contend, and with reason, that the work they do in restoring health and saving life keeps many families from needing Poor-law relief; that they actually help to reduce the rates, and therefore should not be asked to contribute to them. There is assuredly a certain meanness in demanding the uttermost farthing from voluntary institutions, whose work, if they left it undone, would mainly devolve on the parishes they are in.

Variations like this make any comparison of accounts difficult, although such comparison is eminently desirable; but the excellent uniform system of accounts laid down by the Council of the Hospital Sunday Fund, and insisted on by them as essential to a grant from their funds, will certainly operate in the direction of lucidity, and will indirectly do much to promote The existence of special hospitals adds to the comeconomy. plication, because the cost of maintaining these varies with every form of disease they treat. There is no doubt that special hospitals have in past times done admirable service. Their moderate size was a matter of infinite convenience when it was only the one or two doctors who wished to initiate new operations or methods of treatment that worked in them, often because their ideas were opposed by indifferent or antagonistic colleagues. But the whole temper of the medical profession has changed, and too great a readiness to try new things rather than too great a slackness is its most conspicuous tendency. Therefore

t

tl

tl

iı

th

st

fo

ai

th

to

W

ha

ce

the

the

the

no young physician or surgeon need found a hospital for himself alone in order to get a free hand. There are special departments in all the large hospitals which meet nearly every requirement; and from the point of view of teaching it is more convenient for students to have as much as possible of their clinical work done under one roof, to obviate the necessity of running from one place to another in order to complete their studieswhich indeed it is not possible for them to do. Young men who aspire to be one day specialists themselves may treat themselves to a post-graduate course on the subject that interests them; but the average man who thinks that his studies should end when he receives his diploma, would, if he depended on special hospitals for special training, often go into practice with very little accurate notion of diseases of the eye, an idea that almost all skin diseases are to be classed as eczema, and a conviction that the complaints of women may all be set down to hysteria, and treated, according to the rank of the patient, by a month's travel, or a pail of cold water. If such men are to learn all the variations of disease, it must be in the general hospital. It is a common cause of grumbling that so many graduates leave college knowing almost nothing of infectious diseases. A man who cannot recognize scarlet fever when he sees it, is not likely to be, from any point of view, a success in practice, and it is to be desired that no one should be allowed to go up for his final examination who cannot produce a certificate of attendance at a hospital for infectious diseases. But such a hospital must be isolated from others, if only to keep it from being a source of danger to patients suffering from non-infectious disease. It stands, moreover, on a different footing from the rest. In the first place it is not, except in rare instances, a voluntary institution; it is supported by the rates. is fitting, for infectious disease is a danger to the whole community, and it is the whole community's interest to keep it from spreading. But some of these hospitals, it is to be regretted, do not bear the best of reputations. They have, it must be allowed, every opportunity to 'go wrong.' Respectability and some degree of efficiency are necessary to the existence of the voluntary hospital. People will not give to an institution which has not some good results to show, and the fact that this indirect but powerful control makes for activity and good work is one of the strongest arguments for keeping our voluntary hospitals on their present basis. But, as we say, the isolation hospitals are tempted. In view of possible epidemics they are always larger than their average needs demand; so is their permanent staff, although in seasons

of pressure it has to be augmented hastily, and often, therefore, carelessly. The nature of the diseases it receives keeps out the intrusive and critical visitor, and it is not difficult to prepare for the perfunctory occasional visits of boards of guardians, most of whom have no desire to hazard their precious lives by too close an inspection of even the best ventilated and disinfected small-pox and fever wards. The result is that great abuses have been discovered more than once in fever hospitals; scandals have come to light which prove, to say the least of them, that the 'infectious hospital,' as it is generally called by an unconsciously satiric public, is not the abode of gloom that public usually believes. Rather is it, in Lord Rosebery's words regarding the Eastern Hospital, as quoted by Mr. Burdett, to the Lords' Committee,—

'a place flowing with milk and honey, or rather with champagne and claret and Burgundy, and things which some people liked better than milk and honey. It was consequently found that the patients there cost three times as much as those in any other hospital. The result of a short inquiry held, as regards the officials paid out of the rates, was that the superintendent resigned, the clerk of the committee absconded, the medical superintendent was suspended, and the clerk of the managers was cautioned.' (Report, Session 1891, July 4, 1891, p. 715.)

In short, the records of these institutions are stained, in many instances, with theft and misconduct, cruel treatment of patients, who are relegated to the care of women unfit morally, as well as by lack of efficient training, to have the charge of the sick, and waste of public money, of which every one gets a share except those for whom it was meant. If an argument were needed against making all our medical charities State-supported, none stronger could be drawn than the condition into which hospitals for infectious disease have sometimes fallen.

A less serious condemnation is that which falls on Poor-law infirmaries; but there the nursing is often shamefully bad. Sometimes there is no trained nurse at all; if there is, she is expected to take charge of a ridiculously large number of beds, aided only by a few elderly pauper women, who totter about the wards where before very long they will themselves lie down to drag out their days. If supplied with a sufficient number of well-trained nurses, the Poor-law infirmaries should relieve the hospitals of all chronic cases, and of many others where no exceptional treatment, but only proper care, is needed to effect a cure. As it is, hospital doctors hesitate to send patients to those cold and gloomy wards where, so far as nursing goes, they are no better off—sometimes, it may be, worse—than in their own poor homes.

But these institutions stand on a different footing from the voluntary hospitals, with which in the public mind they are not even connected, and it is with voluntary hospitals that we have to do. To those who are interested in the welfare of the hospital system the needless and apparently endless multiplication of small special hospitals is an anxiety and a We do not mean those places established by some pushing physician or surgeon, who keeps his name on the register by advertising his 'hospital' with himself as its head, instead of frankly advertising himself, and makes his living out of patients' fees. These are often very successful and profitable shops; but they are not, in our meaning of the word, hospitals. We allude to those small institutions which derive their income, at least in part, from the disinterested contributions of the public, and which in return do some gratuitous work,—the great mass of ophthalmic, orthopædic, ear and throat hospitals, and the like: do they deserve support? They did once, when there were few special departments at the general hospitals, or none; but having shown a good example, which has been widely followed, a great part of the use of the special hospital has vanished. The pioneers may claim the right to survive, in virtue of the good work they have done; but half of their successors might well be absorbed by the nearest general hospital, to prevent the needless diffusion and waste of the money of the charitable. Some special hospitals none would wish to suppress, because the general hospitals cannot undertake their work. Such are the Consumption Hospital at Brompton, with its long, conservatory-like corridors, where those hot-house plants, the patients, enter for at least three months; and the National Hospital for the Paralysed and Epileptic in Queen Square, where in addition to long residence the patients often require expensive electrical treatment and the most delicate operations of cranial surgery. The majority of the cases treated there are not suitable for general hospitals, and some refuge for them is therefore needed. But all special hospitals are not as these, and the multiplication of small 'specials,' often under the shadow of a general hospital, is a mistake and an extravagance.

An extravagance, and a most reprehensible one; for every penny that is subscribed could be well disposed of. It is necessary, in face of the too-general emptiness of the hospital treasury, to spend only to the best advantage. Hospital treatment is in any case an expensive thing, and economy is the more needed that it is much more expensive than it used to be. The most direct cause of the increased expense is the enormous

improvement

i

c

b

a

0

a

b

h

n

ir

W

0

th

m

u

b

of

be

m

fa

th

st

th

th

be

m

be

nt

ta

improvement in nursing which this generation has witnessed. When a woman became a nurse because she was too old to get employment as a domestic servant, or perhaps because her habits or character prevented her retaining a situation as such; when the day-nurse slept in the basement and the night-nurse dozed in a corner of the ward; when nursing meant only the careless and unskilled doing for helpless patients of such offices as they could not possibly fulfil for themselves, and not a thing beyond, nursing might well be cheap. It is not, even now, an over-paid profession, so far as individual wages go; but the nursing staff has been increased to an extent the old nurses would have thought absurd. Not less absurd would they think the scrupulous cleanliness, the test-tubes, the thermometers; and they would be surprised at the absence of those outbreaks of erysipelas with which they were familiar. But the number of the nurses and their youth would have bewildered them above all. If, instead of one old and uneducated woman, kind and well-meaning as she might be, you have half-a-dozen young, strong, intelligent, educated ones, you must pay for it; but your patients will profit. The average staff in a London hospital and in the best of the provincial ones is one nurse to every three and a half patients, and yet the cry is that this is not enough, that nurses are overworked, have too long hours in the wards, not enough time off duty, not a sufficiently long annual holiday. The life of a nurse is not an easy one, the work is both hard and anxious, and in spite of the introduction of ward-maids to scrub floors and clean grates there remain for the nurses proper much dusting and polishing of furniture, and many of those duties called 'menial 'with which they are unfamiliar in their homes. These duties form the stumblingblock in the path of the sentimental probationer, who dreams of being the newest Santa Filomena, and sees no connexion between the wearing of an aureole and the making of a bed with mathematical accuracy. No wonder that so many faint and fail, no wonder that to their over-tired frames the simple food that is set before them seems unpalatable, the matron's instructions and reproofs unreasonable and harsh. Poor girls! they have taken up a task beyond their powers, and the sooner they lay it down the better. Desirable as it is to have refined gentlewomen for our nurses, it is first of all essential that they be strong, healthy, intelligent women, who can bear strain of mind and body without giving way under it, or needing to be kept up by any kind of dainty treatment. Unfortunately nursing has become a fashionable occupation, and so has been taken up by those who have no natural fitness for it. The 2 K 2 honour

e

n

n

e

s

1

e

e.

ıt

honour justly paid to the true nurse has turned the heads of the aspirants, and made them poseuses, exacting, conceited. They are no longer members of the hospital staff, servants of the suffering poor, but a privileged class, elect, apart, to whom a special deference must be paid. This notion is at the bottom of all the nurses' grievances we hear of. The semi-conventual uniform, the dropping within the hospital walls of all outside distinctions, though convenient and appropriate in themselves, have perhaps contributed to the development of the idea that every nurse is a noble creature, 'enskyed and sainted,' and in so far as she is connected with earth very liable to be made a

martyr.

We would not be unsympathetic, we are ready to welcome every improvement in the nurse's lot; but it is not possible to make it a life of leisure, or of anything but difficult, continual, and often repulsive duties, and this must be realized by those who take it up. On the vexed question of the nurses' food, about which so much was said before the Lords' Committee, it seems reasonable that they should have a sufficiency of plain but good and nourishing diet, and enough time to eat it in, and we think that in most institutions this is given. Certainly a simple lunch of some sort should be given between a breakfast at 6.40 and a dinner at 1. This, it seems to us, is a necessity; but otherwise we see no room for improvement. It is not to be expected that dainties can be provided out of the purse of charity for women who are presumably in good health.

It is, after all, a question of the purse, as is also that increase of staff which has been demanded. If it really affects the health of the nurses, these valued and valuable servants of the hospital, let any sum be spent that is necessary to keep them in efficiency and reasonable comfort; but it is necessary for the stewards of other people's money to be firm in refusing to give more. There is now attached to every hospital of importance a nurses' home, plain but comfortable in its furnishing; the separate bedrooms, small as they are, acknowledge the need and give the opportunity of privacy; the time allowed for rest and exercise, if strictly adhered to, is sufficient; a nurse is, on the whole, as well off as any class of working women; and it is with these we must compare them, not the idlers who neither toil nor spin.

The food and rest agitation, though the only one that directly affects the hospital, is but a small part, a detail of a larger complaint. The demand of the Royal British Nurses' Association for the registration of nurses is the outcome and full expression of that desire to set the nurses apart from all the

ather

other hospital workers to which we have alluded. It goes on the assumption that a nurse's competence stands on exactly the same footing as a doctor's competence, and can be as surely tested by examination. But what examination can be instituted for patience, gentleness, tact that combines firmness with soothing, readiness in emergencies, and endurance under strain,-the moral qualities essential to a really good and successful nurse? We do not speak of ordinary sobriety and propriety of conduct. Any failing in these, if sufficiently vouched for-it is true that the proof might be a matter of some difficulty-would probably be punished by removal from the register; but the finer qualities which, as much as any knowledge of how to take a patient's temperature or slip a clean sheet under him with the least possible disturbance, have raised nursing to its honourable position in the public esteem, may be known to those who have trained the nurse, and may be expressed in the certificate she receives from them; but they cannot be tested by examination nor set down in figures, as a phrenologist sets down the facts he infers from the bumps on the head. The opinion of the majority of those who have to do with the training of nurses is against it; and it is demanded most loudly by those nurses who, spoiled by public praise, think more of their status than of their work.

Happily these are comparatively few. The majority of nurses, like the majority of hospital officials, are hard-working and disinterested. Our medical charities have lately had to stand a searching examination, and they have come out of it successfully. Those who conduct them love the work they are engaged in. It is they who will read with most interest and comprehension the books we have now before us, who will glean hints as to construction from the admirable plates in 'Hospitals and Asylums of the World,' suggestions as to administration from its full and careful statistics, guidance of many kinds from the accounts given of every hospital system on the globe. To us of the outside public these volumes may be merely interesting,-we may admire the industry, the research, the tireless energy that built them up, and there make an end; but to hospital workers they must be invaluable. For though our hospitals are good, it does not follow that they might not be better; that though the natural growth which has characterised them hitherto has been successful, a more systematic development might not prove even more beneficial to the community.

To this end we make the following suggestions:—Any one wishing to establish a new hospital should require a license to

do so, to be obtained from a legally constituted court, before which he would have to prove that the neighbourhood where he intended to found it required such hospital accommodation, and that it was at a sufficient distance from the nearest hospital to make a separate institution preferable to an addition to the existing one.

A uniform system of keeping accounts, similar to, if not identical with, that recommended by the London Hospital Sunday Fund, should be introduced and pressed upon hospital secretaries. The advantage of comparing the cost of maintaining metropolitan and provincial hospitals, the latter of which so often seem to be more economically conducted, would be great; but it is impossible until the accounts of all are kept on the same principle. If possible, all accounts should be deposited in a central bureau, so that secretaries and governors should be able to compare those of various institutions, with a view to ascertaining where economies could be effected.

A more careful inquiry should be made into the means of all applicants for hospital aid, especially out-patients. Provident dispensaries and pay-hospitals of various degrees of luxury might be developed for the convenience of those who are able to pay for attendance, but for one reason or another cannot conveniently be treated at their own homes. Poor-law infirmaries should be put on such a footing with regard to nursing and medical attendance that they could relieve the voluntary hospitals of chronic and other unsuitable cases; it being made clear that entering one of these did not cause the patient to be regarded as a pauper.

Every hospital should be inspected once a year by a competent official, who should report on structure, administration, and discipline. Besides this annual inspection, this official should pay surprise visits, when he should taste the food provided for patients and nurses, and note the condition of the wards. A sanitary expert should test the drains, &c., of the hospital once a year.

Much might be added to these few suggestions; in practice much would be. And we cannot doubt that the publication of so many books dealing with the question of hospitals predicts and will aid that perfect combination of efficiency with economy which all who honour and value our medical charities must desire to see

ART. VIII.—1. The Sheptics of the Italian Renaissance. By John Owen. London, 1893.

2. Pietro Pomponazzi: studi storici su la Scuola Bolognese e Padovano del secolo xvi. Per Francesco Fiorentino.

Firenze, 1868.

d

0

e

t

1

e

e

h

s

d

r

e

d

1

e

 Sulla Îmmortalità dell' Anima di Pomponazzi: Esame storicofilosofico, con l'aggiunta di molti documenti inediti. Per G. Fontana. Siena, 1869.

 La Psicologia di Pietro Pomponazzi secondo un manoscritto inedito dell' Angelica di Roma. Del Prof. Luigi Ferri.

Roma, 1876.

IN the 'Skeptics of the Italian Renaissance,' a continuation of his 'Evenings with the Skeptics,' Mr. Owen has given us a book of unusual merit and of great interest, yet one in which he lays himself open to some not altogether favourable criticism. The book consists of a series of essays of various degrees of excellence on Dante, Petrarch, Boccaccio, Pulci, Machiavelli, Guicciardini, Pomponatius, Giordano Bruno, and Vanini, accompanied by what seems to us awkward and sometimes commonplace and diffuse comments on the essays in the form of a dialogue. We should be disposed to demur to the application of the term 'sceptic' (even when spelled with a k), used in its philosophical sense, to several of these thinkers; in fact it can scarcely be applied with strict accuracy to any of them, as Mr. Owen himself admits, except to Pomponatius; nor do we think that either Dante, the earliest, or Vanini, the latest of the so-called sceptics, can be properly described as thinkers of the Renaissance. In the writings of Dante no trace of the Renaissance is to be found. In form as well as in thought, Dante is wholly medieval; while the Renaissance had spent its force even in England, perhaps the latest country where it was developed, before Vanini had written a line. But it would seem that Mr. Owen would carry on the Renaissance to the eighteenth century, for from his references to his forthcoming work, 'The Skeptics of the French Renaissance,' it appears that he includes among them Huet, who died so late as 1721; and though in his 'Traité de la Foiblesse' the learned Bishop of Avranches shows himself in the strictest sense of the term a philosophic sceptic, we fail altogether to see how it is possible to consider him as one of those of the Renaissance. But as a contribution to the history of Philosophy, and to our knowledge of the thinkers and writers whom he discusses, Mr. Owen's book has very high merits. We do not indeed always find ourselves

ourselves in agreement with his philosophical views, nor are these always expressed with sufficient clearness and definiteness to enable us precisely to understand them. But the book displays at once wide and deep research, freshness and liberality of thought, and throws a flood of light upon persons and subjects upon which English literature is singularly deficient, Mr. Owen rightly conceives of the Renaissance as a movement towards the emancipation of human thought from the trammels of medievalism and sacerdotalism, a movement in favour of intellectual freedom, not indeed from an anti-religious, but from an exclusively non-religious standpoint. The essays on Dante, Boccaccio, Pulci, Machiavelli, and Guicciardini, are, we think, decidedly inferior to the rest of the work-they are somewhat commonplace and superficial. The author has nothing to tell us of these personages but what has been said before, and, he must forgive us for saying, has been said better. But on Petrarch he gives us much that is both new and true; and although the position of Petrarch as the first of the moderns, the first humanist of the Renaissance, has often been recognized, yet his hostility to scholasticism, his criticism of medieval dogma, his clear recognition of inordinate power as disastrous to the true aims of Christianity, his broad culture and his liberal sympathies, are set forth by Mr. Owen more clearly and more forcibly than we have noticed elsewhere except perhaps in Renan's 'Averröes et l'Averroisme.' But on the vexed question of Laura we are not prepared entirely to agree with him, and we must demur to the justice of his remark that 'either the Laura of those highly-wrought productions—the sonnets-must have been an ideal personage, or her lover was a profligate below contempt.'

The special interest and excellence of Mr. Owen's book consist in the essays on Pomponatius, Bruno, and Vanini, to whom more than half the volume is devoted. Of Bruno indeed much has previously been written even in English, and the English reader has had the means of acquiring at least some superficial knowledge of his life, his character, and his writings; but a really satisfactory biography of him, with an accurate account of his works, and a just view of his philosophical system by one who has thoroughly studied and understood his writings, is still to seek. For innumerable as are the books and essays upon him in Italian, German, French, and English, and admirable as is the Life by Professor Berti, the documents discovered at Venice and Rome since the publication of that work in 1868 have thrown a flood of light upon his history and his character, as well as on his trial and

execution;

execution; and though these have been made use of by Mr. Owen, much still remains to be done before we get an

adequate presentment of this remarkable man.

d

t.

at

ls

of

ut

n

7e

re

as

id

T.

e ;

en

of

as

ps

ed

th

at

ne

a

k

to

ed

he

ne

is

ın

18

nd

as

h,

ti,

he

ht

nd

n;

But on neither Pomponatius nor Vanini have we anything in English. To each indeed Hallam has devoted a page of judicious comment, and reference is made to both in Lecky's 'History of Rationalism,' and in one or two philosophical Handbooks. Bayle's sympathetic account of Pomponatius is to be found in the translations of his 'Dictionary'; Miss Young's 'Life and Times of Paleario' contains a brief analysis of the 'De Immortalitate Animæ'; and an interesting though not entirely satisfactory notice of his opinions may be read in Symonds' 'Renaissance in Italy.' The superficial and unfair 'Life of Vanini,' by David Durand, was translated into English in 1730, and a chapter concerning him largely taken from Durand's work is contained in Miss Plumptre's 'History of Pantheism,' and with some alterations is repeated in the 'Antiquary' for 1886, but with these exceptions even the names of Pomponatius and Vanini are hardly to be found in any English books. The absolute neglect of Vanini by English writers is the more remarkable in that he passed two years in England, and much interesting matter relating to his visit is to be found in our State Papers; extracts from which, first given by Palumbo in his Life of Vanini (Naples, 1878), have been made use of by Mr. Owen, whose essay on Vanini, and particularly his defence of the unfortunate philosopher from the misleading account given by Victor Cousin in his 'Fragments Philosophiques,' is one of the most acceptable and satisfactory parts of his work.

Though Mr. Owen devotes to Bruno the longest, and to Vanini the most interesting chapter of his book, Pomponatius (for we prefer to call him by the name by which he is generally known, rather than by his Italian name of Pomponazzi), perhaps a less attractive personality than either, and one, of the details of whose life we have but few particulars, is the central figure of his book,—the single 'philosophical skeptic,' as he candidly admits, in his list; the first in date of modern philosophers, the earliest original thinker of the Renaissance, who in his book 'De Immortalitate Animæ,' and its continuations, the 'Apologia' and the 'Defensorium,' laid the foundation of the philosophy of the Italian Renaissance, and perhaps of all modern philosophy. Without going quite as far as Mr. Owen in giving to him the same position in the intellectual history of Italy as Descartes in that of France, or Bacon in that of England, we may agree that he is 'the founder founder of a new method, the first to break off, on the ground of logic rather than feeling, from scholasticism and medieval philosophy—to refuse allegiance to the traditional standards of preceding centuries, to insist upon the indefeasible right of human reason to enquire and determine for itself what

is true in philosophy and religion.'

Although, as we have said, nothing has before been written on Pomponatius in English, yet he has not been neglected on the Continent, and of late years much attention has been given to him and his writings, particularly indeed in Italy, but also to some extent in France and Germany. During the century which followed his death, the controversy respecting the nature and existence of the soul and his opinions respecting it continued to be carried on with as much bitterness as during his life; but until lately the histories of Philosophy of Brucker, Buhle, and Tennemann, and the articles in Bayle's 'Dictionary' and Niceron's 'Mémoires,' were the only available sources of information, except his own works, for the life and opinions of the Italian philosopher. In the brilliant essay on 'Averroës and Averroism' with which M. Renan may be said to have commenced his literary career in 1852, he gave to the world an admirable, though at least in the first edition a somewhat superficial, account of the doctrines of Pomponatius, accompanied, however, with a more precise and accurate statement of the philosophical opinions of the school of Padua, and of the position of Pomponatius in relation to Averroës and Alexander of Aphrodisias, than had previously appeared. It was reserved, however, for Professor Fiorentino, in his remarkable monograph on Pomponatius, to give to the world for the first time in 1868 an adequate biography of the man, resting largely on unprinted correspondence and on entries in the Archives of Padua and Bologna, and an almost exhaustive account of his philosophical opinions, based on a thorough and independent study, not only of his three best known treatises—the 'De Immortalitate,' the 'De Incantationibus,' and the 'De Fato,'-but also of the 'Apologia,' the 'Defensorium,' and the 'De Nutritione,' which had previously been very little studied. Professor Fiorentino's book lends itself to only one unfavourable criticism,—he is too great an admirer of his hero, too anxious to show that in his philosophy he was always right, too ready to make excuses for him, and always not quite fair to his opponents. His book was reviewed by A. Franck in his 'Moralistes et Philosophes' (Paris, 1872), where that writer, while fully recognizing its merits, shows himself less favourable to Pomponatius and his opinions, and does more justice to his opponents than had been done by Fiorentino. The main interest of Signor Fontana's 'Esame' consists in the fact of its containing several unpublished letters to and from Pomponatius, as well as other documents relating to him, which had escaped the researches of Fiorentino. In 1877, Luigi Ferri printed in the Proceedings of the Reale Accademia dei Lincei (and issued a certain number of copies as an independent work) 'La Psicologia di Pietro Pomponazzi,' based principally upon an unpublished manuscript in the Angelica Library at Rome, 'Pomponatius in Libros de Anima,' a large part of which is printed as an Appendix to the volume, and which Ferri considers to be a copy of the lectures of Pomponatius on the 'De Anima' of Aristotle delivered at Bologna in 1520.*

Mr. Owen gives us a very brief biography of Pomponatius, accompanied by a full and satisfactory account of his opinions, largely taken from Professor Fiorentino's book, though showing that he has read with care and appreciation the treatises of Pomponatius on the Immortality of the Soul, on Fate, and on Enchantments. But we regret that he gives us so meagre an account of the controversy to which the publication of the first-mentioned book led, and that he does not seem to have made an independent study of the 'Apologia' or the 'Defensorium,' the two books of Pomponatius which are the fullest in biographical as well as controversial detail.†

Pietro Pomponazzi—known to his contemporaries, partly from his small stature, partly from the Italian fondness for diminutives, as Peretto—was born at Mantua on Sept. 16, 1462. His family is said to have been noble, and was certainly well known there, having enjoyed the protection of the

^{*} Professor Ferri's work was reviewed very unfavourably by Fiorentino in the 'Giornale Napolitano' for April 1877, where the soundness of Ferri's views of the doctrines of Pomponatius is no less impugned than the accuracy of his transcript of the manuscript. Fiorentino considers that accuracy cannot be expected from one who in his Life of Cardinal de Cusa mistakes the word 'Retribucionis' for a proper name, and creates an imaginary 'Petri Bucionis'! Ferri replied in 'La Filosofia di Scuole Italiano' for June 1877, and a rejoinder was given by Fiorentino in the 'Giornale Napolitano' for August 1878, in an article on the MSS. of Pomponatius at Arezzo.

n an article on the MSS, of Pomponatius at Arezze.

† Mr. Owen is strangely inaccurate in his bibliographical statements. He tells us that the 'De Incantationibus' was 'published' in 1520, while in fact, though vritten in 1520, it was not printed until 1556, and that the 'Apologia' was 'first published 1578' (perhaps a misprint for 1518); he includes the 'Contradictoris tractatus doctissimus' of Contarini among 'the most valuable of all the writings of Pomponatius for forming an estimate of his character,' and he describes the edition of the two treatises 'De Incantationibus' and 'De Fato' printed in 1567 as 'the Basle edition of his collected Works,' and calls it a folio instead of an octavo.

house of Gonzaga during two centuries. His father, John Nicolas, he seems to have had in much affection, since he commemorates his name at the end of nearly every one of his works. All that we know of his youth is that he studied medicine (the department which then included philosophy) at the University of Padua, and that he there had for his teachers the two Trapolinos, Antonio and Pietro,* Francesco de Neritone, and Pietro Roccabonella,-all, except perhaps Antonio Trapolino, Professors at Padua, eminent in their day, but now little more than names; he speaks of them all, however, with respectful admiration. In 1487 he took his decree of Doctor in Medicine, and in the following year was appointed extraordinary Professor of Philosophy in conjunction with Alessandro Achillini, who had four years before been appointed to a like chair, and who, although described by Mr. Owen as then ordinary Professor, did not attain that coveted position until some years later.

The University of Padua was at this moment at the height of its reputation as a School of Philosophy and Freethought. The doctrines officially taught were indeed those of Aristotle, but, as understood and explained by Averroës, 'che'l gran commento feo,' and the latter half of the fifteenth century is the period of the absolute reign of Averroës at Padua. His Great Commentary was the text-book of the professors of Philosophy; and when, as is frequently the case in the philosophical writings of the fifteenth century, 'the commentator' is speken of, it is Averroës who is intended. From the middle of the fourteenth century he had been read and lectured on at Padua, but a great impetus was given to the study of his writings in 1436, when Gaetano of Teano—sometimes spoken of as the founder of Averroism at Padua-began to lecture on the Great Commentary, and from this time his influence increased not only in Padua, but throughout all North Italy during the remainder of the fifteenth century. With the students of scholastic philosophy, who were still and through all the sixteenth century numerous notwithstanding the opposition of the humanists, no writer was more popular. His Commentary on the 'De Anima' of Aristotle was one of the first books printed at Padua (in 1472), and during the century which followed hardly a year passed without the publication of an edition of his works in Latin-at first in the barbarous translations of the thirteenth century, but latterly in revisions made by learned Jews, after the more accurate Hebrew

^{*} Not 'Antonio and Trapolino,' as Mr. Owen writes.

translations.* Opposed to the doctrines of the Catholic Church as the opinions of Averroës seem to us, they were taught for some years, at least as philosophical opinions, even by orthodox theologians, without any objection on the part of the rulers of the Church. Thomas de Vio Cajetan had himself lectured on the Commentaries of Averroës, and it was not until the later years of the fifteenth century, that the heresy which lurked under the teaching seems to have been noticed. From 1471 to 1499, Nicoletto Vernias was ordinary Professor of Philosophy and one of the most determined Averroists. He maintained and openly taught-at least as a philosophical theory-the opinion of Averroës, that the individual soul emanates from, and is again absorbed into the soul of the universe; thus practically, if not theoretically, denying the immortality of the individual soul: yet when the same doctrine was put forward more clearly and distinctly by his pupil Augustino Nifo (Niphus) in his treatise 'De Intellectu et Dæmonibus,' scandal was caused, and it needed all the authority of the pious and tolerant Barozzi, then Bishop of Padua, to allay the anger of the partisans of Thomas Aquinas and Albertus Magnus, whose arguments against the doctrine of Averroës were treated in the book with but little respect. At the date of the appointment of Pomponatius as extraordinary Professor of Philosophy, the somewhat emasculated Averroism which Niphus then and afterwards professed and taught, was the recognized doctrine at the University of Padua. But it was not really a philosophical system, it was little more than a barren and soulless 'Neither life nor thought,' remarks Renan, 'is to be found within that dry husk. The boldness is only in the mere words; the philosophical language, twenty times distilled, contains nothing within it; the psychology is merely a jingle of sonorous words and realized abstractions.' The chief exponent of this philosophy was Achillini; for though, as Ritter has pointed out, he expressly rejected the opinions of Averroës on the unity of souls and collective immortality, yet where it was possible to do so without clearly falling into heresy, he followed the Great Commentary not only in its language and its scholastic method, but also in its doctrines.

With the advent of Pomponatius, all this was changed, and

^{*} Even the great edition of the complete works of Averroës given by the Giunta at Venice in 1552-3 was not made direct from the Arabic. It was in part a new translation from the old Hebrew translations, in part a revision of the old thirteenth-century Latin translations. Averroës himself knew no Greek, and his acquaintance with Aristotle was only through the imperfect and often incorrect Arabic translations.

a new era was opened for the philosophical school of Padua. Living thought took the place of mere verbal discussion; ideas took the place of words; the true nature of the soul, the great problems of natural religion, of providence and of personal responsibility, of 'fate, free will, foreknowledge absolute,' began to be discussed with freedom and with intelligence even while the scholastic method was followed. Speculations not less daring than those of the eighteenth century were openly and freely propounded, and led naturally to the examination of theological questions, and to conclusions that were the reverse of orthodox. While neither neglecting nor despising Averroës, Pomponatius avowed himself in philosophy a disciple of Alexander of Aphrodisias, who admitted not even collective immortality, but simply and absolutely denied the immortality

of the rational soul.

Although the importance of the disputes between the followers of Averroës and Alexander of Aphrodisias has been unduly magnified, and though it is perhaps scarcely accurate to divide the Paduan school at this period, as some have done, into Averroists and Alexandrists, yet undoubtedly the nature of the intellect and the soul, interpreted according to these opposite views, formed, if not the chief subject, at least that which excited the most interest, not only in Padua but in other Universities of the North of Italy, in the first years of the sixteenth century. 'Quid de anima?' 'Tell us about the soul' was the almost universal cry with which the professors of Philosophy were greeted by the students, until at length the teaching which followed upon this, drew the attention and excited the alarm of the rulers of the Church, so that at the Lateran Council held in 1512 the doctrines of the two philosophers respecting the soul were equally The Bull, which is dated the 19th of December, 1512, condemned those who taught with Alexander that the individual soul is not immortal, as well as those who with Averroës maintained the doctrines of collective unity and collective immortality. It went further still; and anticipating the argument of the 'De Immortalitate' of Pomponatius (which however not improbably had been already put forward by him in his lectures, and which indeed he shared in common with several contemporaries and predecessors), that these opinions, although contrary to the faith, might be true philosophically, it declared that all who held such doctrines to be heretics and infidels. The Bull, however, seems to have received scarcely any obedience and to have had little or no effect; indeed Renan finds it difficult to treat seriously a Bull on such a subject issued by Leo X. and countersigned Bembo!

The

The disputations between candidates for University degrees, or between a candidate and a Professor, which so long continued and of which traces still exist, had a curious development in the University of Padua, and possibly in other Italian It was the custom there for two professors Universities. of the same subject to dispute and to maintain opposite views with a view of stimulating the intelligence of the students. These disputations or discussions were looked forward to by both students and professors with as much interest and excitement as the debate at Oxford on the Copernican and Ptolemaic systems, before the Polish prince Albert à Lasco, of which Giordano Bruno, the champion of the Copernican system, has left us so animated and graphic an account in 'La Cena de le Ceneri.' It appears, indeed, that the two Professors of Philosophy were respectively selected from those who were known to hold different views on philosophical subjects; and as Achillini had been for four years the champion of the emasculated Averroism which as we have said then reigned at Padua, Pomponatius, who was known to be an adherent of Alexander of Aphrodisias, was probably for this, among other reasons, chosen as a professor 'extraordinarius,' with a view to his being the opponent of Achillini in the disputations.

Achillini, now at the height of his reputation as a philosopher and Averroist, his only rival being Augustino Nifo—'Aut diabolus aut Magnus Achillini' is said of him, as similar words have been applied to other eminent scholars—was only four years older than Pomponatius, but four years makes an immense difference in a University career. He was an experienced debater of great learning and much dialectical power, but his young rival—'Peretto,' as the students called him—carried off the honours of the debates. Mr. Owen has attempted not without considerable success a detailed representation of one of these discussions, from which our space only allows us to

make a few extracts :-

^{&#}x27;Achillini is a striking-looking man of about thirty years of age. He is rather tall and stout in proportion, though a student's stoop of the shoulders detracts somewhat from his height. He possesses an intellectual countenance, which in repose seems placid and reflective, with large dreamy-looking eyes. He walks up to his desk with a careless slouching gait. His professor's gown, we notice, is torn in several places, and is further remarkable by its narrow sleeves and general scanty proportions. Instead of forming a train behind him, it scarcely reaches below his knees. Evidently a man regardless of personal appearance. His adversary, on the other hand, is almost a dwarf, with a powerful-looking face, a broad forehead, a hooked nose which

which imparts a somewhat Jewish cast to his features, small piercing black eyes, which, as he turns here and there, give him a peculiar expression of restless vivacity. His thin lips are almost continually curled into a satirical smile. He has scarce any hair on his face, so that there is nothing to hide its sudden and perpetual change of

li m

ei

it

Ph

le

fr

ir

P

b

ir

A

81

0

B

a

m

be

th

ci

SI

fr

expression. . .

Achillini, with a loud and rather coarse voice, but with great deliberation of manner, lays down in a short speech the proposition he intends to defend. "The intellect is simple, uniform, indecomposable. This is clearly," he affirms, "the opinion of Aristotle, as testified by Averroës, his greatest commentator; and he is willing to defend this position against all comers." When Achillini thus ends his brief preparatory address, his partisans applaud for several seconds. But a still greater storm of cheering arises when Pomponazzi stands forward at his desk and throws his restless eagle glance over the noisy crowd. So short is his stature that he can hardly be discerned. . .

'When these amenities have ceased, Pomponazzi begins to speak; and in a tone of voice, full, clear and round, which makes itself heard in every part of the hall, he takes exception to Achillini's argument. The intellect, he maintains, is not simple but multiple; and this he will prove is Aristotle's real opinion, who must be interpreted not by the misty and incomprehensible comments of Averroës—a man of alien race and mental sympathies—but by the lucid testimony of his great fellow-countryman, Alexander of

Aphrodisias. . . .

Both combatants profess to be guided by Aristotle; but as there is no Greek text which each equally acknowledges (and if there were, neither would have been able to read it), the advantages of possessing a common authority are merely nominal. Achillini is evidently a man of immense erudition and dialectical power, and his tactics are directed either to overwhelm his adversary with some formidable and crushing dictum, or to ensuare him in the meshes of an involved and insidious argument. In either case his attempts are utterly foiled by the caution and vigilance of his foe. Pomponazzi is too wary to allow himself to be impaled on the horns of a dilemma, or caught in a well-baited half-concealed dialectical trap. He is also prompt to turn the tables on his powerful, though somewhat unwieldy, antagonist. In quickly uttered sentences, he takes exception to a few words, or some short proposition, in the longdrawn argument which Achillini has just announced; and with flashing eyes and a sarcastic smile he burlesques them by a witty parallel statement, points out their inherent absurdity, and thus raises a laugh at the expense of his foe. Or, more at length, and in serious measured tones, he analyses Achillini's propositions, points out some glaring inconsistency between their different parts, or between the conclusion sought to be deduced and the dicta of standard authorities. . . .

'Achillini typifies scholasticism: with its methods and ratiocination—

nation—formal, ponderous, elaborate, and unelastic. Pomponazzi represents modern thought: keen, eager, restless, vivacious, caring little for traditional processes and authorities merely as such, and much for the clear, simple dictates of unfettered human reason. The fact that such a scene was possible, that popular and academic sympathies were already enlisted on the side of philosophical neologianism, is a clear indication of the transition of thought which was taking place in Italy; and which claims Pomponazzi as one of the earliest and most potent of the instruments which combined to effect it.

Fiorentino cites a document dated 1495, in which Pomponatius is styled ordinary Professor of Natural Philosophy, but it was certainly not until 1499 that he really obtained that position as successor of the venerable Nicoletto Vernias, who had held it since 1471, and whose special distinction it was that he was allowed to retain it without a colleague or opponent. A letter from Pomponatius to Bernardo Bembo-father of his friend and pupil the future Cardinal-lets us know that the influence of Bernardo-not of the Cardinal, as Mr. Owen states -had been used in his favour, and that to this he owed the position. Of his life at Padua we have hardly any details. In 1500 he married the daughter of Francesco Dondi dall' Orologio. but does not seem to have had any issue by this lady, who died Though he knew no Greek, the 'De Anima' of Aristotle, with the Commentaries of Alexander of Aphrodisias, and the writings of Aquinas, Albertus Magnus, and Richard of Swineshead, were the special subjects of his studies and of his lectures. In 1509 the war of the League of Cambrai compelled the University of Padua to close its doors, and its professors equally with its students had to seek new homes. Pomponatius found a refuge at the University of Ferrara, where he continued his studies and his lectures for two years. When the death of his former colleague and rival Achillini, who had been invited to Bologna in 1509, rendered vacant the chair of Philosophy there, Pomponatius-who at this time was at Mantua-was invited to fill it, with a salary of nine hundred Bolognese lire.

Whatever censure we may pass upon the policy of the Popes and upon the personal ambition which led to the aggrandizement of the temporal power, there can be no doubt of the benefits which accrued to Bologna by its incorporation with the States of the Church by Pope Julius II. in 1506. The city had long been misgoverned and tyrannized over by various small despots, who had interfered no less with its municipal freedom than with the growth and development of the University,

which during the second half of the fifteenth century had lost much of the reputation which it had acquired in the fourteenth, and was to regain under the peaceful and liberal administration of the Popes. A senate of forty magistrates was appointed for the city and province, and their administration, as Sismondi tells us, recalled the liberty and the independence of the city, while a body known as the 'Riformatori dei Studi' was appointed to regulate the affairs of the University, which was administered with no less wisdom and liberality than was displayed by the forty magistrates in their government of the city and province. It was to this body that Pomponatius was indebted for the invitation to fill the chair of Philosophy; he enjoyed the sympathy and the confidence of its members until his death, and, as Mr. Owen remarks, he was indebted to them for much kindness and support during the most critical part of his life.

1

t

r

In 1514 Pomponatius published his first work, 'De Intensione et Remissione Formarum ac de Parvitate et Magnitudine.' It is partly a commentary and defence of the opinions of Aristotle upon the measurement of form, partly an answer to the work on the same subject of our countryman, Richard of Swineshead, known as Suiseth, and styled 'Calculator,' of which several editions appeared at the end of the fifteenth and the beginning of the sixteenth century. The Physics of Aristotle, unlike his ethical and logical treatises, have ceased to have for us any living interest, but the subject of the work was one of the accustomed controversies of the time. Niphus tells us that he had disputed on it at Bologna, and we learn from the preface of Pomponatius that the idea of the work had been formed at Ferrara, and that he had disputed (possibly with Achillini) on the subject at Padua. The following year (1515) he wrote another work, entitled 'De Reactione,' in which he comments upon the opinion of Aristotle that everything is at once active and passive; and this was followed by another tract on the question, whether a real action can immediately arise from a spiritual species. In these works we find no original thought. The matter, equally with the style, is that of the innumerable commentators not only on Aristotle, but on other philosophical subjects, of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, where the aim seems to be rather to display the ingenuity of the commentator, particularly in trifling and verbal distinctions, than to arrive at the truth, or even at the meaning of the writer commented on.

It was not until 1516, at the age of 54, that Pomponatius published his famous treatise of the 'Immortality of the Soul,'

in which, as Fiorentino remarks, 'ceasing to be a commentator, he reveals himself as an original thinker, and lays the foundation of the philosophy of the Italian Renaissance.' Like most of his works, this was in its origin a mere pièce de circonstance. During an illness he held discourses with his pupils concerning the future world. One of them, Girolamo Natalis of Ragusa, a Dominican friar, thus addressed him after one of these discourses: 'Master, you said the other day that the doctrine of Thomas Aquinas respecting the immortality of the soul, although absolutely true and admitting of no manner of doubt, was yet inconsistent with that of Aristotle. Now I wish you would tell me first, what-entirely apart from revelation, and dealing merely with natural reason-you think on the subject; and next, what is Aristotle's opinion on the matter.' The request was supported by numerous other pupils who were present, and the book is its answer.*

The book-a folio of thirty-two pages only-is not less repulsive in style and manner than the previous works of its author. Whatever the novelty and freedom of its conclusions, it is in form, as Mr. Owen justly remarks, 'rigidly scholastic; it has its full quota of the ponderous argumentation, puerile distinctions, and subtle refinements which characterize generally the productions of the Schoolmen.' But if it is conservative in style, in substance it is revolutionary. To discuss, however, the 'thorny labyrinth of dialectics' of which the treatise mainly consists, would be foreign to the intention of this paper; it is sufficient here to say that Pomponatius maintains that, according to reason and according to Aristotle, the soul appears destined to die at the same time as the body, and that the authority of revelation and the infallible teaching of the Church alone make us believe that the soul is immortal. The argument, in fact, whatever the real opinion of Pomponatius, amounts to a denial of immortality as maintained by the Christian Church; and as M. Franck has remarked in his 'Moralistes et Philosophes,' the treatise might be called more justly Concerning the Mortality, rather than Concerning the Immortality, of the Soul. Pomponatius confessed that as a Christian he believed, but as a philosopher he did not believe in the immortality of the soul. The doctrine of twofold truth—that is to say, that there are two

9.

e

d

at

ın

ve

le,

le,

th

he nd

he

ius ul,

in

^{*} We are at a loss to understand to what Mr. Owen refers when he says that 'the immediate occasion of writing this book is differently told,' and then proceeds to say that 'Fiorentino tells the story' which we have narrated above. We are not aware of any other account of the occasion of writing the book than that given in the text, which is told to us by Pomponatius himself in the preface to the 'De Immortalitate.'

spheres of thought, the sphere of reason and the sphere of revelation, and that these two are totally distinct-has been discussed by Mr. Owen at considerable length and with considerable ability in his 'Evenings with the Skeptics,' and we shall not here attempt to decide the question whether it is possible to maintain and to sincerely hold this paradoxical doctrine. Certainly it was professed not only by Pomponatius, but by other philosophers of Padua and Bologna. Under the guidance of reason alone, they examined philosophical and even certain theological doctrines with unflinching logic, and without in the least caring to what conclusions, however unorthodox, their enquiries led them; nor were they in the least troubled that these conclusions were diametrically opposed to the doctrines of the Church which they professed to accept as matters of faith. They made no attempt to reconcile reason and faith, and the fact that these were treated as two distinct spheres of thought enabled them to pursue their investigations with absolute independence, and with a purely rational method.

In the case of Pomponatius it is certainly doubtful to what (if any) extent his profession of religious belief was put forth with a view to divert attention from the extent and preponderance of his philosophical scepticism. In expressly submitting to the authority of the Church, he used the current language of philosophy in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, which, as Hallam has remarked, must be judged by other presumptions. Yet we should be unjust to Pomponatius if we considered him either as a hypocrite or insincere. He had no desire to oppose the doctrines of the Church, but was willing to acquiesce in them, and was no more (though perhaps no less) an unbeliever than Nifo, Bembo, or Leo X. himself. He probably persuaded himself that he actually believed the doctrines of the Church. 'Heaven forbid,' he says in one of his later works—the 'Defensorium'—'that an honest man should have one thing in

his heart and another in his life.'

But the 'De Immortalitate' is not merely a philosophical disquisition on the soul and the duration of its life. The doctrine of a morality antecedent to and resting on a higher authority than Christian dogma, and to be followed neither in the hope of future reward nor the fear of future punishment, is here for the first time set forth with a clearness and force that we are accustomed to associate with the philosophy of two centuries later. 'The essential reward of virtue,' he says, 'is virtue itself, that which makes a man happy; the punishment of the vicious is vice itself, than which nothing can be more wretched and unhappy.' And again, 'Suppose one man acts virtuously without

without hope of reward, another, on the contrary, with such hope: the act of the second is not so virtuous as that of the first,' and he concludes that, 'whether the soul be mortal or immortal, death must be despised, and by no means must virtue be departed from, no matter what happens after death.' He admits that the mass of mankind, 'brutish and materialized,' can only be induced to act virtuously and honestly by the belief in immortality and in future rewards and punishments, and accordingly approves of the wisdom and prudence of those legislators, whether Christian or other, who have adopted these hypotheses as the basis of their ecclesiastical systems.

We cannot be surprised that a work containing such opinions, notwithstanding the author's formal submission to the Holy See, should have at once aroused the indignation of the clergy. At Bologna, indeed, it was received with admiration, and neither the University nor the Legate, in the first instance, seem to have had any fault to find with it. It was at Venice, strangely enough, not in the Papal dominions, that the storm burst

forth.

It was to a noble Venetian, Marco Antonio Flavo Contarini, a relation of the future Cardinal, that the book was dedicated. Other copies speedily arrived in the city. The attention of the Doge was called to its impiety, and it was referred by him to Bartolomeo di Spina, a Minorite friar-who seems to have been the very person who invoked the enquiry-to report upon. This man distinguished himself by the bitterness of his attack on the book and its author. He denounced it with great violence from the pulpit as well as in his official report; the clergy were aroused, the sale of the book was forbidden, and a copy of it formally and publicly burned by order of the Doge. The author and the book were equally declared from the pulpit to be heretical and schismatical. Nor did the really learned men of Venice receive it with much more favour. They were especially indignant that the authority of Aristotle should be adduced against the immortality of the soul, and declared that the book was untrue, and was not in accordance with the principles of the Stagirite.

The priests and monks might well be alarmed. Whatever their real opinions, they could not see without dismay a doctrine attacked upon which the whole ecclesiastical system rested. The pious and sincere Christians—for a few such there were even in Italy at the beginning of the sixteenth century, some of them fanatical followers of Savonarola, some sincere but reasonable Christians of the school of Sadolet and Contarini—could not fail to be shocked, not only at the opinions of Pomponatius on the

mortality

mortality of the soul, but at his irreverent, and sometimes even contemptuous treatment of the language of the founder of Christianity, and at his treating Christianity itself as if it were merely on an equal footing with other religions of the world. But there was another point on which the popular feeling was scandalised. For more than two centuries, Aristotle, to the credit of the Catholic Church be it said, had been recognized as 'the master of those that know;' he had been considered almost as a Father of the Church; his doctrines, at least as interpreted by Avicenna and Averroës, had been reconciled with those of Christianity, and his infallibility was no less assured than that of Augustine or Aquinas. Petrarch's remark that after all Aristotle was only a man, and did not know everything, has been characterized by Professor Mézières as 'une parole mémorable, la plus hardie peut-être qu'ait entendue le moyen âge.' The shock was great to find it asserted that Aristotle doubted, if he did not actually disbelieve in, the immortality of the soul, and that his writings, if carefully studied, proved its mortality.

I

ł

The first pen that was employed in a reply to the book was that of the virtuous and excellent Gaspar Contarini, perhaps the most learned, and, with the exception of Sadolet, the most Christian Italian of the day, distinguished no less as a theologian than as a philosopher, a mathematician, and a diplomatist, and who nearly twenty years later was to be raised to the dignity of a cardinal. In his youth (he was now thirty-three years of age) he had studied philosophy at Padua under Pomponatius, whose favourite pupil he appears to have been, but, unlike his master, he was at heart a devoted and pious Christian, though philosophy was his favourite subject of study, and he had at least this advantage over his master, that he was able to read Aristotle in the original Greek, and had thus made himself thoroughly acquainted not only with his philosophical works, but also with those of the Greek commentators. In his reply to his master's work he treats both him and his arguments with the profoundest respect; and if he is not always successful in his disproof of the arguments of Pomponatius, he at least shows always with fairness and candour, that the arguments of Pomponatius are not entirely conclusive, and his exposition of Aristotle not always sound. Before the book of Pomponatius had appeared, Contarini having heard that he had on hand a treatise which was reputed to be contrary to the faith, wrote to him begging him not to publish it; but Peretto was not to be persuaded, though he courteously replied to his former pupil. As soon as Contarini had written his refutation, he sent it, apparently in manuscript, by the hands of their common friend, Pietro Lippomanno, Bishop Bishop of Bergamo, to Pomponatius, who immediately sat down to prepare a rejoinder, which he completed in 1517, and which was published at Bologna in February the following year, under the title of 'Apologia.' It is dedicated to Cardinal Sigismund Gonzaga, and is accompanied by a letter recommending it to Pietro Bembo. The first book is a temperate and moderate answer to Contarini; the second, equally temperate, is a reply to Father Vincentio de Vicenza, a professor of Bologna, who, in a lecture on the 'Summa' of Thomas Aquinas, had criticised the work unfavourably. In the third book, Pomponatius replies to the bitter attacks which had been made upon him in the pulpits and elsewhere, and especially to those of Ambrogio Fiandino, Bishop of Zamora and suffragan of Mantua, whose sermons in the cathedral church of his native city had especially chagrined Pomponatius, who here not only defends but develops the theory of the 'De Immortalitate,' and inveighs with no less bitterness than his adversaries had used against him, and with abundance of sarcasm, against the vices and the ignorance of the clergy. It is from this book that we learn the details of the attacks made upon him by the monks,-'cucullati,' as he calls them; of the burning of his book at Venice, and the attempts made by the monks to have him and his work condemned by the Pope.

In order that there might be no suspicion of unfairness in the answer to Contarini, his treatise—though without the name of the author-' Contradictoris tractatus doctissimus,' was printed by Pomponatius as an Appendix to his 'Apologia,' and, with the rejoinder of Contarini to the 'Apologia,' appears in the collected works of the Cardinal (printed at Paris in 1571) as one treatise, 'De Immortalitate Animæ adversum Petrum Pomponatium.' In the meantime, a complaint against the book (by whom is not certain) had been laid before Leo X.; but by the influence of Bembo, -not then a cardinal but Pontifical Secretary only, to whose father's influence, as we have seen, Pomponatius owed his first important preferment,-nothing further was done by the Pope, except that it would seem, from a document cited by Ranke, in his 'History of the Popes,' that Leo ordered the retractation of Pomponatius, though without any formal con-But a refutation was thought necessary by one who would be less friendly to Pomponatius, and less moderate than Contarini, and who would be able to adduce a greater weight

^{*} This second tract of Contarini does not seem to be anywhere referred to by Pomponatius. Possibly it may not have been brought to his notice, or not even composed until after his death; certainly it was not printed in his lifetime.

of argument than Fiandino. The man of the highest reputation in Italy as a philosopher at this time was Augustino Nifo: as a Professor of Padua he had, as we have seen, commenced his philosophical career as a determined Averroist. A pupil of Vernias, he wrote a treatise, 'De Intellectu et Dæmonibus,' which caused a terrible scandal at Padua in 1492. The publication of the book was only allowed with the suppression of several passages and the correction of others. Nifo was not of the stuff of which martyrs were made. He was ambitious not only of fame but even more of Court favour, and henceforwards he devoted himself to the reconciliation of reason and faith; and although from this date forwards Nifo is known as the leading Averroist of Padua, and a few years later the editor of the works of his master, yet he was careful to interpret Averroës as far as possible in accordance with orthodoxy, and wherever this was impossible to protest against the ignorance of Averroës, and to separate himself clearly from his opinions. Indeed his orthodoxy is always ostentatiously displayed. In his commentary on the 'Destructio Destructionum' of Averroës, Renan tells us that we find constantly these expressions: 'At nos christicolæ . . . at nos catholici,' while his marginal notes often run as follows :- 'Non potest intelligere Averroës quod Deus sit in omnibus: o quam rudis!-Male intelligis, bone vir, sententiam Christianorum!' But his name was inseparable from that of his master. Averroës alone had understood Aristotle; Nifo alone had understood Averroës.

> Solus Aristotelis nodosa volumina novit Corduba, et obscuris exprimit illa nodis Gloria Parthenopes, Niphus bene novit utrumque Et nitidum media plus facit esse die.'

Each of the Universities of Italy desired to have him as a Professor, and he lectured with ever increasing reputation at Padua, Pisa, Bologna, and Rome. He obtained the good graces of Charles V., and was the favourite of several learned princesses, among others Jeanne of Arragon, to whom he dedicated his treatise 'De Pulchro,' where he praises the several parts of the person of the princess, which he describes as the criterium formæ, in a manner hardly consistent with our modern notions of decorum. But his chief patron was Leo X. He was exactly the theologian and philosopher to please the Pope in his writings, and still more in his conversation. He knew how to pass from grave to gay, from lively to severe, and his conversation was full of broad jests and facetious stories, as fitted for amusing Leo X. as those with which a century earlier Poggio

Poggio had entertained the Gentlemen of the Chancery of Martin V. The Pope created him a Count Palatine, and permitted him to quarter with his own the arms of the Medici. It was to Nifo that Leo committed the charge of refuting the work of Pomponatius, and thus, as Renan has remarked, by a strange inversion of rôles, the Averroists, who up to that time had represented the negation of human personality, became for a moment against Pomponatius the defenders of immortality and the supporters of orthodoxy. His book, which appeared in 1518, is shallow, superficial, and confused. He aims at showing that Pomponatius had misinterpreted Aristotle, that individual immortality is more conformable with philosophical truth than even the collective immortality admitted by the Averroists, and that Averroës had on this point misunderstood Aristotle. The book was considered to be a complete and satisfactory refutation of that of Pomponatius. It was dedicated to the Pope, who probably enjoyed greatly the controversy between his favourite theologian and the Professor of Bologna, upon a subject which no doubt seemed to him of no sort of practical importance.

In the meantime two much more violent and less cogent replies to the book of Pomponatius had been printed by the two ecclesiastics who had been the first to sound the note of disapproval—the Bishop of Zamora and Bartolomeo di Spina. The Bishop's book * appeared at Mantua about the middle of 1519: the name of Pomponatius nowhere appears in it, but he is the 'Assertor Mortalitatis' named on the titlepage. The book is in the form of a dialogue, in which Pomponatius figures as one of the interlocutors under the name of 'Sophista'; and, as is usual in controversial dialogues, an easy victory is obtained over him by the other disputants, in language much more forcible than the arguments themselves. 'O execrandum hominis caput, o pestiferam et perniciosam linguam, et ex agro hujus vitæ radicitus evellendam, o labem, o maculam, o tabificum venenum societatis humanæ. . . . O hominem ad odium natum, ad contentionem instructum, ad perfidiam educatum,' is one of the specimens given us by Fiorentino of the language used of Pomponatius by the Bishop.

Bartolomeo di Spina devoted two works to the same subject.†
The object of the first of these is to confute the 'De Immor-

^{* &#}x27;De Animorum Immortalitate a doctore Magistro Ambrosio Neapolitano Episcopo Lamosense et suffragano Mantuano . . . contra assertorem mortalitatis,' Mantua. 1519.

^{† &#}x27;Opusculum contra Petrum Pomponatium Mantuanum quod tutela veritatis de immortalitate animæ nominatur,' and 'Flagellum in Apologiam Peretti.' Venetiis, 1519.

talitate' of Pomponatius, the second to reply to that part of the 'Apologia' where the author refers to Bartolomeo and his other opponents. Di Spina is, if possible, more violent than Bishop Ambrogio, and appeals to the Inquisition to do its duty in

suppressing both the man and the book.

Pomponatius replied to Nifo by his 'Defensorium,' which appeared at Bologna on the 18th of May, 1519. He answers the book of his opponent chapter by chapter; and though he certainly develops in the direction of materialism the opinions and arguments of the 'De Immortalitate' and the 'Apologia,' he equally, as in those books, submits himself to the Church, and ends by the declaration of his own firm belief, in conformity with the Catholic faith, in the immortality of the soul and the

resurrection of the body.

Before the publication of the 'Defensorium,' the author, with the approval of the Vice-Legate and the Inquisitor of Bologna, submitted it, together with the 'De Immortalitate,' to the judgment of Chrysostomo Javelli di Casale, a learned Dominican, Professor of Theology at Bologna, who returned the books to the author accompanied by a very courteous and even complimentary letter, and by a number of 'Solutiones,' or 'answers to the arguments tending to prove the mortality of the soul which are to be found in the first treatise of the most excellent Pomponatius and in his defence against Nifo.' These 'Solutiones' were forthwith submitted to the Vicar-General of the Cardinal Archbishop of Bologna and to the Inquisitor of the City, and both these authorities declared that the 'Solutiones' having been accepted by Pomponatius, they were content that the books should be printed and sold together with the explanations of Javelli, 'notwithstanding the order issued by us in pursuance of the decree of the Lateran Council.' These approvals are dated 3rd and 4th of March, 1519.*

These three treatises—'De Immortalitate,' 'Apologia,' and 'Defensorium'—constitute the philosophical system of Pomponatius, and really form but one book, which must be studied in its entirety in order to obtain an exact idea of the author's position, and of his opinions on the soul and the intellect.

A further treatise, 'De Nutritione et Augmentatione,' published by Pomponatius in 1521, brings the controversy to a close as far as he is concerned. In this work—a commentary on certain doctrines of Aristotle, or rather attributed to

^{*} Fiorentino (p. 45) cites the approvals of the 'De Immortalitate' as dated in March 1518. We think he is in error. In our own copy of this most rare document the date is M.DXVIIII, which at first sight looks more like 1518 than 1519.

him in the barbarous translations and paraphrases of some of his writings, written in the repulsive and scholastic style of the 'De Reactione' and 'De Intensione' - Pomponatius, in the opinion of Fiorentino, repeats and develops in a materialistic direction the doctrines he had laid down in the 'De Immortalitate.' But this is denied by Professor Ferri in his 'Psicologia di Pietro Pomponazzi,' and the controversy on this subject was continued in Italian philosophical reviews with a degree of warmth, as Mr. Owen justly remarks, out of all proportion to the intrinsic importance of the point at issue. The question is one which depends on extreme refinements of language and dogma as to the nature and functions of the intellective soul, and is really of little interest or importance; indeed it is one which can only be understood or appreciated by those whose minds are thoroughly imbued with both the language and the doctrines of scholasticism. It is sufficient for our purpose that in the 'De Nutritione' the author in no way withdrew from the position he had previously taken in the 'De Immortalitate,' the 'Apologia,' and the 'Defensorium.'

But though Pomponatius's part in the discussion was finished, the actual controversy itself may be said to have been only begun. The ball started by our philosopher was kept rolling by a series of men of more or less eminence and ability for upwards of a century. The ablest of those who in the sixteenth century adopted the views of Pomponatius was undoubtedly Simon Porzio, of Naples, whose treatise 'De Humana Mente' (Florence, 1551), if it has had less reputation than that of Pomponatius, not only equals it in ability, but surpasses it both in style and in the fact that Porzio was acquainted with Greek, and had read and understood Aristotle in the original.*

In the meantime Pomponatius had been occupied with two works, not directly bearing on the immortality of the soul, but not less sceptical and rationalistic in their tendency. In 1520 he completed two treatises, the one 'Concerning Incantations or the Causes of marvellous Effects in Nature,' the other 'Concerning Fate, Free Will, and Predestination.' These works, though often stated to have been printed at Bologna in the year in which they were completed, in fact were never printed during the life of the author, but remained in manuscript for about forty years after their composition. In 1550 the physician William Gratarolo, who had both studied and taught at Padua,

Ì

1

s

0

m

^{*} The latest work intended as a direct refutation of Pomponatius is that of the Jesuit Antoine Sirmond, who, so late as 1625, printed (at Paris) 'De immortalitate anime demonstratio physica et Aristotelica adversus Pomponatium et asseclas.'

was forced to leave his native country on account of his Lutheran opinions. He brought with him to Basle copies of these two treatises, and printed the 'De Incantationibus' there in 1556, with a long and interesting dedication to Otho Henry, Count Palatine of the Rhine.* Eleven years later, in 1567, he gave at the same press a second edition, accompanied by the De Fato, Libero Arbitrio, et De Predestinatione, with a dedication to Frederick, Count Palatine, the son of his former patron. If these two works have not had the actual celebrity of the 'De Immortalitate,' they have undoubtedly enjoyed a greater popularity. They have been more read and more quoted, and probably for these reasons: they are printed in a clear type and without contractions, which makes the reading of them much easier than the other works of Pomponatius; the style is by comparison natural, easy, and flowing; and the matter is entertaining. Although the author is careful always to write as a Peripatetic, there is but little trace of scholastic dialectics, and nothing of the 'ponderous argumentation, puerile distinctions, and subtle refinements' which have already been noticed as characterising the 'De Immortalitate.'

Quotations from both these treatises abound in the works of Vanini; but though that writer professes himself an ardent disciple of Pomponatius, and though his writings are frequently referred to as largely based on the study of the 'De Immortalitate,' this is an entire error. In neither of the works of Vanini is there any trace of a knowledge of the 'De Immortalitate,' or indeed of any of the writings of Pomponatius which appeared in the author's lifetime. His quotations, his arguments, and his references are entirely based on the two books printed by Gratarolo, and in his 'Amphitheatrum' he admits that though he had heard of the 'De Immortalitate,' he had never seen a copy,-a circumstance which should not surprise us, considering the excessive rarity of the only two editions which existed in Vanini's time. The other editions bearing the impress 1534, as well as those—three according to Brunet which are without date, are really productions of the seventeenth

^{*} The Life of Gratarolo, in the 'Biographie Universelle,' literally bristles with mistakes, particularly in the references to Pomponatius. It is there stated that Gratarolo was a pupil of Pomponatius at the moment when Pomponatius was spreading among the young students the doctrines of Luther! As a matter of fact, Gratarolo was nine years old at the death of Pomponatius, who had ceased to lecture at Padua six years before his birth. Moreover, it is curious that in no work of Pomponatius, nor in any one of those written to refute him, is there the slightest reference to Luther, or any intimation that the writer had even heard of the German reformer or of the new doctrines then being preached in Germany.

and eighteenth centuries, certainly most and probably all of

them printed subsequent to the death of Vanini.

Vanini was an ardent Averroist, a student of the writings of John of Baconthorpe, 'the prince of Averroists, from whom I have learned to swear only by Averroës.' But though he calls Pomponatius his divine teacher, and styles his book 'De Incantationibus' a 'golden work,' he could never have written his famous sentence, 'that Pythagoras would have said that the soul of Averroës had passed into the body of Pomponatius,' if the earlier works of his divine teacher had been known to him.

In the 'De Incantationibus,' Pomponatius professes to write at once as a Peripatetic and as a Christian. He believes that his statements are in accordance with the Peripatetic philosophy, and consonant with the truth of the Christian religion. If anything that he writes is not so consonant, he submits wholly to the Church and to its correction. Yet his arguments, like those of the 'De Immortalitate' and the 'Apologia,' are absolutely inconsistent with the theological doctrines of the Catholic Church. The book was written, as the author tells us, in answer to enquiries by a physician of Mantua respecting cures which, as he alleged, had been effected by charms and incantations. Accordingly Pomponatius discusses the possibility of the existence of supernatural powers, of angels and spirits, good and bad, with powers for good or evil. As a Peripatetic, he denies their existence; they only exist in popular imagination; natural effects, he argues, can proceed only from natural causes. It would be ridiculous and absurd to despise what is visible and natural in order to have recourse to an invisible cause, the reality of which is not guaranteed to us by any solid probability. He proceeds to the subject of miracles, which he considers as rare natural phenomena, in no way opposed to nature, but arising from natural causes of which we are ignorant. Many of these so-called miracles, however, arise merely from the subjective influence of the faith of the subject. Physicians and philosophers know that the causes of so-called miraculous cures are faith and imagination, and that, in the case of relics, the bones of dogs would have the same effect as those of holy men if the imagination and faith of the patient were equally applied to them. But here again he puts forward the doctrine of double truth. The Church recognized the existence of angels and spirits, and as a Christian he is therefore compelled to acknowledge their existence. The Church has recognized miracles; and though many of these he considers to be simulated, and others, even some of those recorded in the Bible, natural events, producing the

1

g

h

of

d

the appearance of miracles upon ignorant people, yet he fully acknowledges the reality of others, where the occurrence cannot be produced by natural causes.

'All these cases,' says Mr. Owen, 'therefore afforded scope for his bipartite faith. As a Christian he received them; as a natural philosopher, pledged to a belief in the irreversible laws of the universe, they transcended both his knowledge and belief. They remained in his intellect, with other truths of the same kind, like an insoluble precipitate, resisting the action of all the chemical substances his knowledge enabled him to apply to their solution.'

Nor does he confine himself merely to expressing a philosophical disbelief, but employs weapons of irony and sarcasm with as much force as Pascal two centuries later. Pure spirits can only operate on matter by material means, and he therefore suggests that spirits who perform bodily cures on men must go about with bottles of medicine and varieties of plasters and unguents, like so many ghostly apothecaries. But while in all these respects Pomponatius writes with a boldness and clearness most remarkable, far in advance of his time, and even of his most enlightened contemporaries, we do not find in him an absolute freedom from what we should now call superstitious ideas. Occult properties and magical powers, which he rejects in demons, he finds in the stars, in plants, trees, and stones, and to these he attributes many of the events which were ordinarily considered as miracles, or as the work of good or bad spirits; and absurd as seem to us his notions on these subjects, we must remember, as Mr. Owen reminds us, that all progress is relative, and that the step from demons and such supernatural agencies to plants, animals, and stones, represents a decided and appreciable advance in knowledge and scientific attainments.

In his book on Fate, Free Will, and Predestination, which he completed four months after the 'De Incantationibus,' Pomponatius still writes as a Peripatetic and as a commentator on the work on Fate and Free Will attributed to Alexander of Aphrodisias; but in this book more than in any other of his works, he seems to endeavour to reconcile reason and faith. His general position, indeed, is the same as in his former books. As far as he can do so without distinctly contradicting the doctrines of the Church, he asserts the doctrine of human liberty as the absolute source and condition of morality. But he is not more successful in his attempts to reconcile human free will with Divine Omniscience than his numerous predecessors and successors have been. He lets us see that his sympathies are with

Aristotle and Alexander in their denials of special providence, but he seems in this book to be more cautious in putting forward opinions contrary to those of the Church than in his former works. He attempts, though entirely unsuccessfully, to reconcile philosophy with the teaching of the Church; and as Mr. Owen remarks, 'he only adopts the alternative of double truth after every conceivable method of reconciling the foes has been exhausted, and in order to avert the flat contradiction of

his philosophical conscience.'

Pomponatius died on the 18th of May, 1525, in his sixtythird year. Of the last few years of his life we know scarcely anything. He had married a second time soon after leaving Padua, and was again left a widower, this time with two daughters. A third wife is mentioned, by whom he had one daughter. He continued until his death to enjoy the protection and support of the authorities of the University of Bologna, and repaid them with warm affection; and although his biographer Fiorentino-with whom Mr. Owen, though with some hesitation, seems to agree—treats him as a confessor, almost as a martyr, 'worn out by years, harassed by sickness, extended on the bed of pain, fighting the battles with his enemies without the splendour of martyrdom, unsustained by the hope of the future, with austere virtue placed before him, without reward and without hope as the true and final end of the human race,' we confess we can find no evidence to support this view. That he was violently and bitterly attacked in the writings and the pulpits of his opponents there is no doubt; that the fanatics would gladly have seen him burnt with his books is equally certain, but, in fact, he never seems to have been in any danger. He was protected not only by the University and city of Bologna, but by the Vice-Legate, who allowed his books to be circulated with the 'Solutiones' of Chrysostomo Javelli. Other Universities, notwithstanding his unorthodox reputation, sought to have him as their Professor of Philosophy. At one time he was disposed to accept the offer of a chair at Pisa, accompanied by a most liberal salary, but the Bolognese were unwilling that the most celebrated Italian professor should leave them, and increased his stipend to sixteen hundred ducats. The House of Gonzaga continued its protection, and he retained to his death the friendship of many eminent and influential ecclesiastics, of whom no less than five then were, or afterwards were to become Cardinals-Pietro Bembo, Gaspar Contarini, Domenico Grimani, Sigismund Gonzaga, and Hercules Gonzaga. Leo X., as M. Renan has pointed out, while formally condemning him, really supported him him and encouraged disputes between him and his opponents, in order that he might have the pleasure of reading their controversial writings, and, with his friend Bembo as Pontifical Secretary, he was certainly not in any danger from the Court of Possibly the stern orthodoxy of Adrian VI., had that Pontiff lived, might have interfered with his safety, or at all events with his prosperity; and had Pomponatius survived a few years longer, it is not improbable that a recantation might have been required of him, and that, like his friend Bembo, he might have been induced to show himself an orthodox Christian. But the papal reaction had scarcely commenced when death removed him from the chances of persecution. He was carried off by fever, though he is stated to have been failing in health for about a year. The University of Bologna paid a high tribute to his honour in its Register of Doctors, where it is stated, that by his death the University had lost its greatest ornament. His former pupil, Hercules Gonzaga, afterwards a Cardinal and the First President of the Council of Trent, caused his remains to be transferred to Mantua, and there erected a bronze monument in his honour in the Church of St. Francis d'Assisi. The church with the bust or statue of Pomponatius was destroyed in 1804, but the inscription was removed to the Church of St. Andrea, where it still exists.

Pomponatius had the satisfaction of living to see the second and collected edition of his printed works, which appeared at Venice at the press of the heirs of Octavian Scotus, the same from which, four years before, the treatise of Nifo against him had issued. The printing was completed on the 1st of March, 1525, just two months before the death of the author. The volume, to the publication of which no objection seems to have been taken either by the civil or ecclesiastical authorities, is entitled 'Petri Pomponatii Mantuani Tractatus acutissimi et mere Peripatetici,' and includes as well the answer of Contarini to the 'De Immortalitate' as the 'Solutiones' of Chrysostomo Javelli to the 'Defensorium,' the title of which, curiously enough, is printed, not as 'Solutiones' but as 'Approbationes Rationum Defensorii per fratrem Chrysostomum'! and what is perhaps still more curious is that although the answers of Javelli to the reasons proving the mortality of the soul in the 'Defensorium' are given, together with the formal approvals of the Vicar-General and Inquisitor of Bologna of the 'Defensorium,' if accompanied with the 'Solutiones' of Javelli, yet the tract 'De Immortalitate Animæ,' to which one would have thought the 'Solutiones' were more necessary than to the 'Defensorium,' is printed without them.

Of

A

ь

P

0

th

to

th

M

da

C

In

ra

yes

t j

Of the tracts comprised in this volume, the only one (with the exception of that by Contarini) which has been reprinted is the De Immortalitate,' several editions of which appeared in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, sometimes without date or titlepage, sometimes with the false date 'M.D.XXXIV.,' but in no case with the name of the printer or place of printing. The earliest known to the present writer seems printed early in the seventeenth century, and is without titlepage. All appear to be based upon the edition of 1525, and contain all the errors in that volume, together with a considerable number in addition; the punctuation is especially incorrect and misleading. In 1791 an edition was given by Professor Bardili at Tübingen, based upon three earlier impressions, but the editor did not consult either of the original editions of 1516 and 1525, and his book can therefore have very little real value.* Although at the present day the tract of Pomponatius has ceased to have any other than a historical interest, yet as a book that has had so much influence, and that has played so important a part in the history of Philosophy, it deserves an accurate and critical edition based upon a collation of those of 1516 and 1525, with the numerous misprints and erroneous punctuation corrected and the references verified.

Pomponatius appears to have left a considerable number of works, probably notes of lectures, in manuscript. A portion of one of these, being a commentary upon the 'De Anima' of Aristotle, has been published by Professor Ferri, as we have before noticed, in his volume entitled 'La Psicologia di Pietro Pomponazzi.' Another, 'Dubitationes in quartum Meteorologicorum in Aristotelis librum,' was printed by Arrivabene at Venice in 1563, but with the name of Franciscus Francisci on the titlepage as the publisher. It is dedicated by Arrivabene to Madrucci, the well-known Bishop of Trent, and is so rare that neither Fiorentino nor Mr. Owen has been able to see it. No copy is in the British Museum. Both Fiorentino and Mr. Owen treat the book, however, as the earliest in point of date of the compositions of Pomponatius; and Fiorentino, whose knowledge of its contents seems principally derived from the article of Brunatius on Pomponatius in the 'Raccolta' of Calogiera (vol. xli.), conceives that it was written at Padua. In this, however, he is certainly in error. Although the book rather resembles the earlier than the later works of Pomponatius in being exclusively a commentary, without the attempt at

^{*} The present writer has been unable to see a copy of this edition. He has sought for it ineffectually through English and foreign booksellers for many years past. No copylis in the British Museum.

1. (Vol. 177.—No. 354. 2 M anything

anything original, and with hardly any independent criticism; and although Pomponatius seems careful to avoid the controversial matter of his more celebrated works, yet it is tolerably certain that it was written at Bologna, and is one of the latest of its author's writings. It is in fact obviously the substance of a course of lectures upon the fourth book of the Meteorology of Aristotle. That it was not composed until after Pomponatius had left Padua, and probably not until 1521, results from the following facts. The author more than once refers to something as happening when he was a student at Padua in terms which he would hardly have used had he been then residing there ('adducam ego argumentum quo scolasticus ad huc Patavii usus sum'); and again, 'My colleague Alexander Achillini held (tenebat) this opinion,'-a reference hardly compatible with Achillini being at that time his colleague. But further, in the 'Dubitationes' the volume of translations from Aristotle by Alcyonius is quoted. These were only printed in 1521 (by Aldus, at Venice); and although it is possible that they might have been communicated to Pomponatius in manuscript at an earlier period, yet as Alcyonius was certainly not born until after 1490, it is clear that the translation could not have been made until after Pomponatius had left Padua. There are also quotations from and references to contemporary writers which, though not absolutely inconsistent with the earlier date, strongly confirm the view that the work was written and the lectures delivered in the later years of Pomponatius's life. The excellent type and absence of contractions, and the general arrangement, make the book agreeable reading by comparison with the other works of the author. It is simply notes for lectures, clearly not prepared or intended for the press; and though these exhibit no originality, yet they possess a certain independence of thought, which gives us a high idea of both the candour and the modesty of the author. Pomponatius is no slave, even to Alexander. Thus in the fourteenth 'Dubitatio,' on the saying of Aristotle that air, water, and earth putrefy, but that fire does not putrefy, he discusses the opinion of Alexander with great freedom, and himself inclines to that of Albertus Magnus and Thomas Aquinas, yet he concludes that the matter is doubtful, and that perhaps Alexander knows best: 'ego autem quia non sum hoc expertus dubito quid in hoc dicam, forte id expertus est Alexander.' Sometimes he ventures to point out an inconsistency between different passages of the master, and even to doubt whether Aristotle is right. He is frequently unable to come to any satisfactory conclusion, and ends one of his lectures with this remark, 'You must take this explanation for

(

b

F

0

h

th

C

ez

a

h:

W

fa

pa

pł

Sc

ar

ar

re

tal

or

COL

Ph

wh

for what it is worth,' and another with 'I have no better explanation to give you than this: if you have one, tell it me.' Once, and only once so far as we have noticed, his doubt is whether Aristotle has been accurately translated. He says that Alcyonius interprets 'stateusis' $(\sigma \tau \hat{a}\theta \epsilon v \sigma \iota s)$ as 'tostio,' and he doubts whether that is quite correct.*

The original manuscript of the 'De Fato' is said by Arpe ('Theatrum Fati,' p. 59) to be in the Escurial. Fiorentino describes † several volumes of manuscripts preserved at Arezzo; and from the Preface to the very scarce tract of Gaffarel (1733), 'Thomæ Campanellæ De Reformatione Scientiarum Index,' it appears that Gaffarel had sent to Bourdelot six large manuscript volumes containing 'the whole philosophy of Pomponatius,' a catalogue of the contents of which would seem, according to Olearius ('Dissertatio de Pomponatio,' Jena, 1709), to have

been printed at Paris in 1633.‡

l,

n

st

1-

le

is on

or

Laying aside the revolutionary character of the doctrines of Pomponatius, we are most struck by the extreme conservatism of his style, his method, and his reading. There is no trace of humanism or of the Renaissance in any of these. His style, though not wanting in a certain amount of vigour, is that of his medieval and scholastic predecessors, not a trace of that Ciceronianism of which his pupil Bembo was one of the leading exponents. Indeed it is difficult to understand, in turning from a book by Pomponatius to one by Bembo, that the men could have been contemporaries and friends, and be supposed to be writing in the same language. Speroni is, however, hardly fair in saying that Pomponatius knew no language except the patois of his native Mantua. His reading is extensive, but it is almost wholly in his own subject. The Greek and Arabic philosophers (of course only in Latin translations), Aquinas, Scotus, Albertus Magnus, and Suiseth of the medieval writers, are those with whom he has the greatest familiarity, and who are oftenest quoted. Occasionally, but very rarely, we have a reference to or a quotation from the poets. In the 'De Immortalitate' there is one long quotation from the Georgics, and two or three other references to Virgil, Ovid, and Plutarch. The contemporaries whom he quotes are almost entirely writers on Philosophy, but we have not noticed any contemporary referred to in the 'De Immortalitate'; nor except for the suggestion which he makes somewhat sneeringly in one place, that from

^{*} Dub. xxxix. , † 'Giornale Napolitano' for 1878.

[†] Operum Pomponstii evulgatorum et MSS nomenclator e Bibl. Jo. Bourdelotii. Paris, 1633. The present writer has been unable to discover a copy of this catalogue.

the torpor of the Christian faith, and from the fact that it had long ceased to work miracles, its end was probably approaching, is there anything to intimate that he in any way sympathised with, or even that he was aware of the enormous change that was taking place in the minds of men, as well in the direction of the more thorough and appreciative study of Greek and Roman antiquity, as in reference to the thought and action of the present and the future. Nor does Pomponatius in his life resemble the scholars of the Renaissance. We find in him nothing of the restlessness, either of mind or body, which characterised so many of them as they went about lecturing and studying from University to University. For the first forty-five years of his life his travels did not extend beyond Mantua and Padua, and during the remainder we find no trace

of any journeyings beyond Ferrara and Bologna.

Only one of the works of Pomponatius has received the honour of a place in the Index, namely the 'De Incantationibus.' The circulation of the rest seems to have been permitted. Of the original editions of the 'De Immortalitate,' 'Apologia,' and the 'Defensorium,' it is probable that very few copies were issued; while of that of 1525, the 'Solutiones' of Javelli and the tract of Contarini, which form part of the volume, together with the work of Niphus, which seems to have been often bound up with it, were probably considered to be sufficient antidotes, and to render harmless the perusal of the books; and whatever may be the violence and unfairness of the attacks on Pomponatius by Nifo, Ambrogio Fiandino, Bartolomeo di Spina, and others, we think the history of the controversy cannot be said to be an instance of the bigotry or intolerance of the Church, but rather of the willingness of her rulers, until an opposite course was forced upon them by the preaching of Luther, to look at least without serious disfavour upon philosophical and theological speculation.*

A

ar

fu

ba

fai

a

sp

sha

of

of

be

the

cla

the

tau

tho

am

of

En

wei

ben

sho

cha

so

four

hard mea of G cher led the wan of I won

^{*} We have met with three engraved portraits of Pomponatius, one given by Olearius in his 'Dissertatio de Pomponatio' (Jena, 1709), which purports to be a copy of a medallion of the sixteenth century, taken no doubt from the bust or statue erected by Cardinal Gonzaga. The medal itself (two specimens of which are known to the present writer) is of admirable execution, but the engraving is completely disfigured and made little more than a caricature by the aquiline nose of the original being converted into what can only be described as a bottle-nose. The second portrait, engraved by Tobias Stimmer, is among Reusner's 'Icones' (Basilee, 1589), and, like so many of the portraits in that book, seems to be simply a fancy sketch, possessing not the smallest resemblance to the ewhich appears on the medallion. An equally unfaithful likeness, evidently copied from that of Stimmer, is to be found in Freher's 'Theatrum Virorum Eruditione . . . Clarorum' (Nuremberg, 1688).

ART. IX.—The Earl of Aberdeen. By the Hon. Sir Arthur Gordon (now Lord Stanmore). London, 1893.

FOR some time past it has been one of the commonplaces of political conversation that the alliance between Liberal and Conservative Unionists must end sooner or later in a fusion. Those who look forward to this event have to look backward to the last great Coalition of English parties, and to reckon with the celebrated dictum suggested by it. The publication of the Life of Lord Aberdeen, the central figure of that famous group which forty years ago once more presented us with a ministry of 'All the Talents,' naturally suggests such a retrospect, and at the same time affords an opportunity of glancing at preceding transactions of the same nature, with the view of ascertaining why it was that England did not love them. We shall soon see that this well-known apophthegm, like many others of the kind, was founded on particular instances, to the neglect of many others of a wholly dissimilar complexion, which might be cited to prove just the contrary: while it happened too that the one of which everybody was reminded by this memorable declaration, was at once the worst specimen on record, and also the one most familiar to the British public. Thus Mr. Disraeli's taunt has gradually become a household word, without much thought being given, except by historical students, to the amount of truth which it contains. Since the establishment of the party system at the beginning of the last century, English history affords several instances of Coalitions which were due to the purest motives, and productive of great benefit to the country. They are not the majority; but they show very clearly what is the one essential, differentiating characteristic of that species of coalition which has earned so evil a reputation for the whole class. These, it will be found, have been almost always either directed against individuals, or else have resulted from a compact so flagrantly corrupt that the whole world could understand its baseness.

Of the latter kind we shall only mention one, though others hardly differing from it in principle might readily be cited,—we mean the Coalition between the Whigs and Tories at the end of Queen Anne's reign, in order that each party might obtain a cherished object of its own. The ultra High Church Tories, led by Lord Nottingham, wanted the House of Lords to pass the Occasional Conformity Bill. The Whigs, on their part, wanted the House of Lords to censure the proposed terms of Peace. The bargain was soon struck. If the Whig peers would vote for the Occasional Conformity Bill, which they had

b

d

W

h

lo

B

el

ta V

b

tu

C

la

J

to

to

re

ir

th

h

tu

si

ai

th

ai

a

th

is

V

always resisted, Nottingham and his followers would repudiate that interpretation of the Grand Alliance which they had always upheld. A more unblushing violation of all principle can hardly be imagined. But there was no such strong personal element in the transaction as there was in some later combinations. Nottingham was angry both with Harley and St. John, by whom he thought he had been slighted; but that alone would not have moved him to take part in so flagitious a compact. The Whigs, of course, simply wanted to turn out the Ministry, and cared very little what price they paid for it. If they could gain their object by the sacrifice of religious liberty, they were willing to do it. This particular Coalition has hardly perhaps received the notice to which it is entitled. That it has had its share in giving Coalitions a bad name can hardly be doubted. But its fame has been overshadowed by others of more recent date, and productive of more lasting consequences.

The next upon our list is the Coalition against Sir Robert Walpole. And this undoubtedly was a combination among men of widely different political opinions for the purpose of hunting down a particular individual who was obnoxious to them all. That Walpole had brought this attack upon himself by his excessive tenacity of power, and his unwillingness to share it with the leading Whig statesmen of the day, may be perfectly true. It was his own fault. But that signifies nothing. The feeling which prompted the confederates was personal resentment. Of course other reasons were assigned; partly real, and partly unreal. The Whig malcontents may really have believed that Walpole was untrue to Whig principles; the Tories that he was only making Parliamentary Government a mask for a new kind of absolutism more pernicious than the old; the Jacobites, of course, were ready to do anything to embarrass a Hanoverian Government: and all alike declared that his Foreign policy was as feeble as his military and naval operations were ill-planned and ill-conducted. They had a plausible case against him. But this alone would not have held together the discordant elements represented by Wyndham, Pulteney, Shippen, Argyle, and Chesterfield. At the bottom of it all was the fierce and unquenchable hatred with which Walpole was pursued by Bolingbroke. His was the hand that planned the Coalition, and which laboured night and day to cement, consolidate, and animate it with his own spirit; and though he was not allowed to complete the work which he had begun, yet he continued after leaving England in 1735 to superintend it from abroad, and suggested many of the parliamentary

Pulteney's

mentary moves by which the Opposition inflicted serious embarrassment on the Government. The Coalition held together, even in Bolingbroke's absence, and succeeded eventually in dethroning Walpole; but when it came to the division of the spoil, the Whigs got the oyster and their Tory allies only the shell. Whether if Bolingbroke had remained in England events would have turned out differently, it is impossible to say. But we fear it is only too true that, as soon as Pulteney found that he could do without him, he resolved to get rid of him. As long as it suited his purpose, he had appeared to fall in with Bolingbroke's ideas, and to be as eager for the construction of a National Party as St. John himself. But after the general election of 1735, he saw, to use a vulgar phrase, that he could take his pigs to a better market. The elections had weakened Walpole, but did not indicate any such marked change in public opinion as to justify the experiment contemplated by Boling-Pulteney thought he would do better for himself by turning out Walpole, and stepping into Walpole's shoes. He continued outwardly to encourage the Coalition, and to use the language which Bolingbroke had taught them. The Tories and Jacobites were still necessary to him; and he was obliged still to dangle the same bait before their eyes. But he never meant to keep his promises; and it is satisfactory to know that he was rewarded as he deserved. The Coalition which was born in personal hatred was buried under personal selfishness, and Pulteney perished in the ruins.

In the year 1741 events had favoured the Opposition. the new Parliament which met on the 4th of December, Walpole had only a small majority, and this began to drop away as soon as the end became apparent. Public opinion had been The perturned against him by the ill-success of the war. sistent misrepresentations of his enemies both in Parliament and the press had told upon the nation by degrees; and after struggling on for two months, on the 31st of January, 1742, the great Minister resigned. Then the Coalition fell to pieces. Pulteney had outwitted both the Tories and the Patriots, and succeeded at first in reconstructing the Government on a purely Whig basis. Some few Tories were admitted; but the general dissatisfaction with the new arrangement remained unallayed, and after about two years of incessant changes, in which the part played by Pulteney (now created Earl of Bath) is not always very intelligible, he found himself deserted by all parties, both by the Pelhamite Whigs, who represented Walpole; by the Patriots, who thought themselves betrayed; and by the King himself, who partly in consequence of Pulteney's cowardice was obliged to part with his favourite Minister, Lord Granville, and abandon the experiment of governing without party which George II. was prepared to make. Pulteney, in fact, towards the close of his career, seems to have reverted to the scheme which Bolingbroke had always favoured, and which the original Coalition, as we have seen, was intended to support. But he had made himself so unpopular that he found it impossible to go on with it, though Granville, with whom he was then associated in the government, was willing to proceed. The attempt was abandoned; and though Granville afterwards rose to high positions in the State, Pulteney after this fiasco is no more heard of.

h

F

b

There seems no reason, however, to doubt that, though the ruin of Walpole was Bolingbroke's primary object, his professions on the subject of party were perfectly sincere. If we separate the public from the personal motives by which the members of the Coalition were actuated, we shall see little to find fault with. There was really some reason for saying that what ought to have been a national monarchy the Whigs were making a Bolingbroke does not seem to have seen, party monarchy. what perhaps none of his contemporaries distinctly understood; namely, that Government without party was not reconcilable with the idea of Parliamentary Government introduced by the Revolution of 1688. In the absence of two organized parties, each demanding the constant undivided allegiance of all its members, the House of Commons would consist only of a certain number of groups or sections of which some would act together to-day and others to-morrow, but which could never claim to represent as a united body any one powerful and welldefined popular conviction, and could never therefore speak in the name of any permanent and coherent national majority. In these circumstances no Government would be obliged to regard the hostile vote of a chance majority acting together for a particular end, and separating again when that was either gained or lost, as an expression of want of confidence by the House generally. Either the Minister or the Sovereign, as the case might be, would thus be to a great extent independent of Parliament; and Bolingbroke would have said perhaps, that as far as the Crown was concerned, he was willing that it should be so. Bolingbroke might have said, 'For Minister substitute King, and I should wish him to be as absolute.' But the holders of political power at that day were not ripe for the reaction; and for the theory propounded in the Patriot King, they never became ripe. A modified form of it did succeed in commending itself to public opinion in another generation, generation, and lasted in full force for half a century; but in the shape which Bolingbroke wished to see it take, it was a failure. Thus, of the twin objects which the Coalition of 1730-40 set before itself, one succeeded and one failed. It destroyed Walpole; but it could not destroy party government.

Thus ended the famous Coalition formed in the reign of George II. for the destruction of a hated individual. Great views of public policy were, of course, placed in the foreground, and up to a certain point those who professed them were sincere. Walpole's administration was very far from being faultless, either at home or abroad. The clamour raised against some of his proposals, notably the Excise Bill, though it may have been interested, was decidedly not empty. But at the bottom of it all lay the hatred and jealousy excited by Walpole himself,-in Bolingbroke because of his attainder; in Pulteney, Chesterfield, and others, because of their exclusion from the Government. Pulteney, we have seen, was ready enough to carry out Walpole's system as soon as he had got Walpole's place; and when the Government finally settled down under the Pelhams, the old system was re-established. The outcry against party had come to nothing; but a precedent had been set for hunting down obnoxious statesmen which was destined to bear evil fruit.

The next Coalition, as was perhaps to be expected, instead of being formed by independent men against the party system, was formed in defence of the party system against independent men. But the inspiring motive was even more purely personal than it had been in the case of Walpole. The Coalition of 1783 is the Coalition, par excellence, of which most readers of English history, however perfunctory their studies, are supposed to know something. It is particularly and pre-eminently the one which England did not love; and, excepting perhaps the affair of 1852, was more largely endowed than any other with those special qualities which distinguish dishonest from honest

coalitions.

After a struggle waged with varying fortune during the first ten years of his reign, George III. found himself in 1770 victorious over all his enemies, and with a Minister in the House of Commons who had both the pliability and the power necessary to the royal purpose, which, roughly speaking, was the same as William III.'s. Lord North was at the head of a strong majority, which he kept to the last. The country welcomed the change; and we were probably more nearly 'on the eve of a bloodless revolution' then, than we were twenty years afterwards, when the second great battle was won against the Oligarchy by Mr. Pitt. The American War prevented

vented the result in the one case, and the French Revolution in the other. And, unfortunately for the King, the Opposition were able to lay to the door of personal government the loss of our American colonies. The charge was utterly unjust, but it was plausible. Yorktown and Saratoga robbed the Government of all its popularity, and the King was obliged once more to make way for the Whigs, who returned to power under the leadership of Lord Rockingham. This was in March 1782. In the following July Lord Rockingham died, and it was then expected that either some other leading Whig, or possibly even Lord North himself, who still had a considerable following in the House of Commons, would be consulted by the King. Instead of that George III. selected Lord Shelburne, one of the Secretaries of State; but a statesman who, besides the evil odour of his early association with Bute, which still clung to him, was personally unpopular. He had moreover already quarrelled with Fox, and might therefore reckon among his enemies the whole of the old Whig connexion which Fox represented. On the other hand, Shelburne had on his side the young son of Chatham, whom Shelburne always looked up to as his master in the art of politics, and the two together were chosen to fight the 'Revolution Families,' who on the appointment of

Shelburne had at once gone into Opposition.

attained such world-wide notoriety. Fox and North, who but two years before had been bitterly opposed to each other, not only on particular measures, but on first principles, who were separated from each other by the whole width of the gulf which divided pure Toryism from pure Whiggism, joined their forces, and determined to 'put down' Lord Shelburne. The whole recess was devoted to the organization of this powerful confederacy; though even now one cannot cease to wonder that it should ever have been brought to maturity. The Whigs, indeed, were far less to blame than the Tories. If they believed that the new Minister intended to revive a method of government to which they had always been opposed, then, however faulty their own ideas of government might be, they cannot be blamed for opposition to Shelburne, with the help of any allies that might offer themselves. Their censure of the peace will not, of course, bear investigation. But that was part of the game. They sacrificed nothing. The Tories, on the other hand, surrendered at one stroke what they had been fighting for ever since the King's accession, what they had

fought for under his grandfather, and what continued to be the note of genuine Toryism down to the death of Mr. Canning.

How

Then at once came about that nefarious compact which has

How Lord North, who had carried on the King's system for twelve years, could suddenly turn round and join with the fiercest denouncers of that system in hunting down the man whose only fault was that he was now chosen to continue it, must always remain to the present writer one of the mysteries of our party history. North was neither greedy of office nor fond of power. It was not enough for him to say as he did, that he had never approved of the system of which he had bear the confidential agent. If that was the case, he should have stood aloof, declining to support Shelburne, but not allying himself with Fox. North, however, did not see matters in this light. The Coalition was formed, and, as soon as Parliament met in February 1783, it commenced operations.

The first thing to be considered was the Treaty of Versailles, by which peace had been concluded in the previous autumn with both France and America. It is sufficient to say that the arguments urged against the treaty were of the flimsiest description, and that the whole world was aware of the truth of Mr. Pitt's assertion, 'It is not this Treaty, it is the Earl of Shelburne alone whom the movers of this question are desirous to remove. This is the object which has raised this storm of faction—this is the aim of the unnatural Coalition to which I have alluded.' The unnatural Coalition triumphed. Shelburne was driven from office, and a new Government was formed under the nominal leadership of the Duke of Portland. But the retribution which awaited them was even more speedy and more crushing than that which overtook Pulteney. Parliament the Coalition was condemned from the first. When Fox presented himself for re-election at Westminster, he was hissed and hooted so that he could not make his voice heard; and the country at large fully endorsed the well-known description of the alliance given by Mr. Wilberforce to his constituents in Yorkshire. 'The Coalition,' he said, 'was a progeny that partook of the vices of both its parents-the corruption of the one and the violence of the other.

And here it may be interesting to inquire what it was that made the British constituencies so hostile to this particular combination. The great body of the electors were too far removed from all contact with political life to take any active interest in the violation of party traditions involved in it. The people were grievously mortified by the loss of the American colonies, and could hardly, one would think, have been very angry with a statesman who contended, as Lord North did, that we might have made better terms with them. The India Bill, no doubt, went some way towards alienating public opinion from Fox;

combination against Shelburne before he had done anything to justify it. It was thought that even Shelburne should have fair play. But we believe the most powerful lever in overthrowing the Coalition was that popular dislike of Whiggism which, as Burke himself admitted, continued in England even all through the period of Whig ascendency. The public had not been greatly edified by the intrigues and manœuvres of the Oligarchy during the first ten years of the King's reign. They had sympathised with his early efforts at emancipation, not caring much, as we may easily believe, for the abstract constitutional questions which underlay them. They gave a ready support to Lord North, and saw no occasion to reject the Minister whom the King had again chosen. The Whig claim to a parliamentary control over this right of selection the people repudiated; and when they saw that the enforcement of this claim was one of the main objects of the Coalition, they uttered that ominous growl at its birth which swelled into a furious clamour before it was a year old. Whether now or ten years earlier we were nearer to the 'bloodless revolution,' matters little. But it does seem quite possible that, had nothing occurred to interfere with Pitt's original policy, the defeat of the Oligarchy in 1784 might practically have anticipated the Reform Bill of 1832, and by transferring power from the aristocracy to the middle classes, while the monarchy was still highly popular and the prerogative in full force, have secured to the Crown many of those powers which fifty years afterwards it was too late to revive. In a different form, and with circumstances suitable to the age, the King of England might have renewed the policy of the Plantagenets. If such a consummation was at any time possible, the course which events were about to take upon the Continent effectually prevented it, by making necessary another Coalition restoring the prestige of the great families.

In the House of Commons, however, their majority was secure for the moment. But George III. was being taught 'to look for the sense of his people elsewhere than in the House of Commons.' The rising indignation of the country emboldened him in the following December to take the decisive step which forms a landmark in our history, and consigned the Whig party to the Opposition benches for the best part of half a century. The Coalition Ministry was dismissed, but the attempt which had succeeded against Shelburne was continued against his successor Mr. Pitt, in whom, however, the Oligarchy found a very different antagonist. Pitt had on his side not only the name of the King, which was just then the name to conjure with, but all the personal popularity which Shelburne wanted. The struggle was sharp but short. On the 19th of December it was announced in the House of Commons that the Right Hon. William Pitt had accepted the offices of First Lord of the Treasury and Chancellor of the Exchequer. During the next three months Fox and North strained every muscle to break down the Ministry, but all in vain. The majority began to fall off in face of the loyal addresses that were pouring in from all the great cities in the kingdom. Private members dared not fly in the face of their constituencies. At length the majority fell to one; and on the

25th of March Pitt dissolved Parliament.

The rest is well known. Pitt virtually was in for his life; and his opponents were scattered like sheep. Thus ended the second great attempt in our past history to hunt down an obnoxious individual by a coalition between parties who had no other bond of union. It succeeded at first as the Coalition against Walpole had succeeded. It failed in the end as the Coalition between Pulteney and Bolingbroke had failed; and brought ruin on its authors as that had done. We have still to notice one other of the same kind, before reverting to a wholly different class of combinations, to which no stigma can be attached. Macaulay says of Lord Chatham that he 'made far too little distinction between gangs of knaves associated for the mere purpose of robbing the public and confederacies of honourable men for the promotion of great public objects.' We must beware of the same error in dealing with Coalitions. The days indeed of the Bloomsbury gang, and the Newcastle ring, have long gone by; but we have still to distinguish between 'confederacies formed for great public objects' and confederacies formed for purely selfish ones-between Coalitions directed against persons and Coalitions directed against principles. Of the latter we have several examples to which we shall presently refer. Of the former the three chief instances in our history are the Coalition against Walpole, the Coalition against Shelburne, and the Coalition against Mr. Disraeli, to which we must now, with the help of Lord Stanmore, endeavour to do justice.

Two positions we lay down at starting: one that the Coalition of 1852 was inspired mainly by jealousy of a person; the other, that Lord Aberdeen's own share in it must be attributed rather to weakness than to selfishness. He was made a tool of by others, and was forced into the position which he occupied by influences too powerful to be resisted. Lord Stanmore's version of the matter may be briefly summarised as follows. It is the

best possible vindication of Mr. Disraeli's account of it which has yet been published. The biographer has seen all the correspondence which passed between Lord Aberdeen and the leading Whigs and Peelites during the summer and autumn of 1852; and we learn from the précis of it which he has given us, that there was hardly a single question on which any two of them were agreed. Mr. Gladstone did not wish at that time to sever the Peelites from the Conservative party. He wished them to remain where they were, constituting its left wing, and looking forward at no distant date to becoming its centre. But Lord Stanmore lets the cat out of the bag when he says that Mr. Gladstone, 'while not indisposed to censure the Government, was most anxious not to break with those by whom that Government was supported, regarding, as he did, the intelligent and sober-minded among them as the best and most valuable raw material of political party in the country.' Now, what did Mr. Gladstone mean by that? He did not want to turn out Lord Derby. He thought the country had benefited by his accession to power. The Colonies were better governed under him. The Church was safe; and he would not touch the Constitution. Mr. Gladstone did not want to turn out Lord Derby, but was not indisposed 'to censure the Government.' Yet he must have known very well that no direct vote of censure carried against the Government could fail to turn out Lord Derby. It was necessary, therefore, to devise some plan of action which might have the effect of dislodging Mr. Disraeli from his position as leader of the party in the House of Commons without breaking up the Administration. Putting two and two together-Mr. Gladstone's anxiety to keep in with the Conservatives, his unwillingness to molest Lord Derby and his willingness to censure the Government,-we can have little difficulty in arriving at his real object. A Chancellor of the Exchequer whose budget was rejected, might either resign his office or bring in a fresh one. We know that Mr. Gladstone pressed Mr. Disraeli to take back his budget, and we may remember Mr. Disraeli's answer. In either case, whether he had resigned or withdrawn, he would be equally discredited, and the way paved for his successor, who was, of course, to be no other than Mr. Gladstone himself. It is impossible, after reading Lord Stanmore's volume, to resist the conviction that this was Mr, Gladstone's scheme. Strongly opposed to the absorption of the Peelites into the Liberal party; regarding the rank and file of the Conservatives, 'the country gentlemen of England,' as the most valuable raw material for political purposes in the country; thoroughly at one with Lord Derby on three such important questions as the Church, the Constitution, and the Colonies—at what else could he have been aiming? There can be no doubt about it. To eject Mr. Disraeli, and lead the House of Commons himself under Lord Derby in the Lords, was, we may be morally certain in 1852, the one ambition of Mr. Gladstone.

Of course he disliked Mr. Disraeli on other grounds also. The bitter assailant of Sir Robert Peel could expect no quarter from Sir Robert Peel's favourite pupil. But the main consideration was, that Mr. Disraeli had come between him and his inheritance. He had felt probably about Sir Robert Peel what Canning felt about Lord Liverpool, that whenever that Minister should retire from office the lead of the House of Commons would, as a matter of course, devolve upon himself; and now another had stepped in and snatched the prize out of his hands. He must have noted, moreover, with growing jealousy and alarm, the hold which Mr. Disraeli was gradually acquiring over that valuable raw material which he so much wanted for himself, and have seen what indeed was the case, that if he was not got rid of very shortly it would be too late.

Yet what was to be done? 'Mr. Gladstone's objections to any further reform of Parliament were,' says Lord Stanmore, 'in themselves enough to forbid union with Lord John Russell and those who were in a manner pledged to it.' One would have thought so, certainly. Yet, as we shall presently see, such was not the case. He thoroughly distrusted the Whigs on all Church questions, and had lately been one of the fiercest assailants of Lord John on the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill:

'The Duke of Newcastle, on the contrary, was prepared for union with the Liberal party, but not to accept Lord John Russell as its chief. Sir James Graham, again, though preferring Lord Aberdeen as the head of a new Cabinet, was not personally unwilling to see Lord John again Prime Minister; but he was aware that Lord Palmerston, the Peelites generally, the Irish members, and a large section of the Whigs themselves, would not consent to it, and therefore considered his accession to office at that time impossible. On the other hand, there was a section of Lord John's friends who dreamed of the restoration of an exclusive Government of pure Whigs, of which the Peelites were to be the humble followers. That was a dream of the past. Such exclusive combinations had now become impossible. It was even then the dream of but few, but the influence of those few with Lord John was altogether disproportionate to their numbers.

'In the midst of these conflicting views, passions, prejudices, and jealousies, Lord Aberdeen sat calm and unruffled, combining as no

other man could have done, what there was of agreement between the different shades of opinion, and minimising the occasions of difference.'

He minimised them, however, to little purpose, and it is rather amusing to find Lord Stanmore speaking of the Coalition in 1853 as a happy and united family, when the different sections of it were still at variance with each other on three such subjects as Foreign policy, Parliamentary Reform, and Church principles. There were no other 'questions of domestic administration' to quarrel about. Lord Stanmore says that the Coalition would have been a great success if it had not been for these differences on Foreign policy. One might just as well say that the Tower of Babel would have been a great success if the builders had been able to understand each other. 'If I tell you that a man is drunk,' said Dr. Johnson, 'and you say that is because he has had too much wine, what is that to the purpose?' It is these very differences of opinion which make all Coalitions, not founded on a unity of principle, so exceedingly dangerous. However stifled at first, they are sure to break out at last. If the Crimean war had not happened, Lord John Russell would certainly have revived the Reform question, on which the Coalition must infallibly have been wrecked. Mr. Gladstone, we are to understand, was not heartily at one with any of these sections. He was paddling his own canoe; and down to the very last seems to have clung to his favourite idea of getting rid of Mr. Disraeli without getting rid of Lord Derby. When he saw that this was impossible, he fell back on Lord Aberdeen, but not till then.

The Coalition of 1852 was then plainly a Coalition against a person. It was directed against Mr. Disraeli alone; that is to say, that with that section of it which determined its bias and character such was the unavowed object. Lord Aberdeen and all the Peelites, of course, shared Mr. Gladstone's feelings about Disraeli, and Lord Aberdeen and the Peelites were the essential part of the Coalition. They were at the same time, curiously enough, being used both by the Court and the Whigs for their own purposes. The Whigs found their hatred of one man a useful weapon for turning out the Tories. The Court found in their freedom from party ties, and their alienation from both sections of the aristocracy, the opportunity of forming a Government more under the control of the Crown than either Whigs or Tories had ever been since the Reform Bill. The Whigs had their own ends to serve. The Court had their own ends to serve. But the determining cause of the Coalition, without which which it could have never taken place, was the necessity for getting rid of the 'upstart' whose success and whose satire were gall and wormwood to men whose prospects were threatened by the one, and who knew not how to answer the other.

In justification of the above remarks we must quote the passage in which Lord Stanmore reveals to us with interesting frankness the motives and objects, the hopes and fears of the Whig party at this juncture:—

'When Parliament met, a practical accord had been established between the Peelites and Whigs for opposition purposes, though it was still doubtful whether it was of such a nature as would suffice to justify official co-operation. While Mr. Gladstone was bent on the accomplishment of the impossible task of separating the Conservative party from the Conservative Government, Lord John and his friends naturally regarded any such aspirations with jealousy; as their success would have entirely altered the balance of strength in the probably impending coalition, and would have rendered it one in which the Conservative element would be dominant, instead of one which would practically consist of the old Liberal party with the addition of a few Conservative elements.

Precisely: Mr. Gladstone's object was to oust Mr. Disraeli and step into his shoes; the Whig object was to use Mr. Gladstone for upsetting the Government, and then to seize the shoes themselves; in which, we may add, they fully succeeded. Lord Stanmore has let a second cat out of the bag.

It was the presence of Mr. Disraeli at the head of the Conservative party which made the Coalition necessary. But for that Mr. Gladstone could have waited, and the prize which he coveted would soon have dropped into his mouth. Of the effect produced on his contemporaries by Lord Aberdeen's accession to office, there can, at all events, be no doubt. Lord Hardwicke, no blind admirer of Mr. Disraeli, wrote to Mr. Croker on the 30th of December, 1852, 'The conduct of Lord Aberdeen and his friends is, in my opinion, disgraceful to them.' On a broad view of the question, it must be allowed that the coalition of Lord Aberdeen with statesmen like Lord Palmerston and Lord John Russell, to whose Home and Foreign policy he had been continuously opposed for nearly a quarter of a century, cannot be divested of a somewhat sinister aspect. Lord Stanmore's excuses for him rest rather on his character than on any evidence that can weigh with the public at large. We are willing to believe that with Lord Aberdeen personal feeling alone would not have weighed as it did with Mr. Gladstone. He may have felt that he was the only statesman capable of forming a strong Ministry, and that he could not desert his Vol. 177.—No. 354. 2 N Sovereign.

Sovereign. But when all allowances are made on this and other grounds, much remains against Lord Aberdeen's credit which cannot be explained away. Lord Stanmore says that 'in opinion he far more nearly agreed with Lord John Russell and his friends than with the supporters of Lord Derby.' But how could this be? Was Lord Aberdeen in favour of Parliamentary Reform, of Palmerstonian foreign policy, of Russellite Protestantism? And if so, how could Mr. Gladstone have agreed with Lord Aberdeen, or how could Lord Aberdeen's only difference with Lord Derby have been caused by Lord Derby's alliance with Protection and No Popery? How on earth Lord Stanmore can reconcile these contradictions in his own mind we are at a loss to understand. They occur on the very same page.

The Coalition of 1852 will always remain a typical illustration of the truth we have so often insisted on,—the danger, namely, of sudden and superficial coalitions between parties whose agreement lies only on the surface, covering a multitude of divergences on public questions of primary importance. It was these dissensions in the Cabinet of Lord Aberdeen which made the Crimean war inevitable. Either Lord Derby or Lord Palmerston, with the authority of Prime Minister, could have prevented it. Divided counsels necessarily left the vessel to drift; when they had run us into war, they continued to paralyse our energies and encourage our adversary: the result being the half-equipped and insufficient army which perished

before the walls of Sebastopol.

Mr. Gladstone has said that 'the Peelites were a public nuisance.' If he had said that they were a public scandal, he would have been nearer the mark. He himself, if not the chief of the Peelites, was the most influential man among them, and his conduct at that time affords perhaps the earliest illustration of the peculiar moral obliquity which has attended him through The Peelites, as was only natural, had three courses before them. They might either have reunited themselves with Lord Derby, when the Free Trade struggle was over, at the earliest opportunity that was offered them; or they might have joined the Whigs, as they did; or they might have kept themselves to themselves, the nucleus of some future party of superfine quality. In our own opinion it was their plain duty to adopt the first of these three courses. The fear of a revival of Protection was a mere pretence. Lord Derby, whenever he came in, must have dissolved Parliament, and the issue must have been determined by the people. If the Peelites were afraid of the result, and did not wish to form part of a Protectionist tectionist majority, they should have waited to see what would happen; and when they found that the General Election of 1852 made a return to Protection impossible, as they knew very well that it did, they should have joined Lord Derby then, Their refusal has already been explained. To have given Lord Derby a majority, leaving the Government in the hands of the existing Ministry, would have placed the Peelites themselves in a very awkward predicament. After the Session of 1852 Mr. Disraeli could not have been deprived of the lead of the House of Commons by his own party. If the Peelites had taken office, they must have served under him. If they had not, they must have waited some years before the ball came to their feet again. Mr. Gladstone professed to be willing to face this situation. But his anxiety to dislodge Mr. Disraeli without turning out Lord Derby is hardly reconcilable with the sincerity of these professions. The real motive of the Coalition was one that could not be avowed, and one that, even by the low standard of morality conventionally allowed to politicians, must be adjudged dishonourable. But we scarcely see how it made 'Peelism' a public nuisance. It would have been more so had the Peelites formed themselves into a third party, hanging on the skirts of the other two, and making a strong Government impossible. The Coalition perished, and not a tear was shed upon its grave. England did not love it. But though unwept and unhonoured, it was not unsung, and will live in Mr. Disraeli's speeches, delivered between 1853 and 1855, as long as the memory of representative government survives in England.

We see therefore that the Coalitions which have been formed for the purpose of hunting down individuals are three in number; that all were failures, and that the intriguers in each case paid dearly for their whistle. Walpole, Shelburne, and Disraeli were the three men against whom they were directed; all three were driven from office, and all three were amply

avenged.

Before going on to the two chief Coalitions which were founded on principle, and therefore at once legitimate, popular, and successful, we are bound just to mention the ministry of 'All the Talents' which was formed in 1806 on the death of Mr. Pitt. This seems to have been an honest and straightforward transaction; it was inspired, so far as we know, by no personal feelings. It was formed to face a grave emergency, the object of it being to give the country a strong government when involved in a European war. But it was formed very suddenly. There had been no gradual approximation of sentiments between Whigs and Tories. The fabric was daubed

daubed with untempered mortar, and that too fell to the ground after about a year of office.

The history of Mr. Canning's Government in 1827 is still involved in some obscurity. There was a split simultaneously both in the Whig and the Tory parties, the moderates on each side coalescing in favour of Canning, and the ultras on each side not indeed coalescing, but uniting to thwart and hamper Mr. Peel referred to the new Administration as a coalition, and it was in fact a coalition against a coalition. was on Canning's part a defensive coalition against both Whigs and Tories to whom he was an object of special enmity. This particular combination, then, was of a very mixed character. No sacrifice of principle was made on either side. The Roman Catholic claims were to remain, as before, an open question; and on Parliamentary Reform and the Test Act, the two other leading questions of the day, Lord Lansdowne and Mr. Canning were pretty much of one mind. On Foreign policy and on the Corn Laws they all agreed. But while on the side of the Government the Coalition was one founded upon principle, the Coalition on the other side was strongly tinged with personal feeling. If the temporary agreement between the ultra Whigs and Tories had ever ripened into a coalition, it would have taken place alongside the Coalitions of 1783 and 1852. But as it stopped short of this, it does not properly come within the list of those transactions which it is the purpose of this article to examine. The public opinion of the day, we think, was decidedly in favour of Mr. Canning and adverse to the ultra Tories who had turned against him. On this point the correspondence of Sir Walter Scott will be found very interesting. He was a decided Canningite, and this testimony from 'the old Scotch Tory,' as Scott called himself, is of great weight. Had Canning lived, the Coalition of the Moderates might have been a great success. But as things fell out, there is not in the affairs of 1827 enough material pertinent to the object of this inquiry to warrant any longer consideration of it.

We now turn to two other Coalitions, which England certainly did love, which were productive of the happiest results, and exhibit in the clearest light the conditions upon which alone transactions of this nature are likely to be permanent and prosperous. The one was in 1795, the other just forty years afterwards.

The French Revolution had brought questions to the front before which all previous differences of opinion between Whigs and Tories sank into insignificance. We should add, with one exception, exception, because, of course, the old bone of contention, the great constitutional question of the royal prerogative, was in some sense the most important on which parties either then or now could be divided. But just then it was in abeyance. Pitt had effected a practical compromise which satisfied himself and seems to have satisfied the King, and at all events for the present the controversy was allowed to sleep. The one subject on which men's minds were then divided was France and the French War. It would not come within the scope of this article to enter upon any vindication of Pitt's foreign policy, or his conduct of the war with France which began in 1793. What is to be noted is that his coalition with a section of the Whigs was effected at a great national crisis, when the very existence of England as an independent nation was at stake. No such peril as this gave rise to the combination of 1730, of 1783, or of 1852. In the second place it is pretty certain that before the French Revolution broke out there were Whigs who disapproved of Fox's attitude on the Regency Bill, and also on the Irish propositions. There had been a growing feeling in their ranks that he was pushing his opposition to factious lengths, and when the French Revolution broke out their disapproval became marked. They recognized the justice of Burke's appeal from the new Whigs to the old, and came to the conclusion that it was their duty to support the Government. The conviction, however, was one of slow growth. Writing of the quarrel between Fox and Burke in 1791, Lord Stanhope says, 'In this memorable quarrel, which had been for some time foreseen as impending, there were many of the Whigs disposed in secret to sympathise with Burke . . . but they all of them felt a natural repugnance to break with their real chief.' The progress of events, however, soon left them no alternative. For some years the moderate Whigs continued more and more to approximate to the views of the Government. During the whole of the year 1793, they gave Pitt an independent support, and finally, in July 1794, the leading men among them joined the Ministry. The Duke of Portland became Home Secretary; Lord Fitzwilliam, President of the Council; Lord Spencer, Privy Seal; and Mr. Windham, Secretary at War. This was a Coalition founded upon principle,-the result of a gradual convergence of opinion upon a question of the highest dignity. There was no personal feeling in the matter whatever. Great Britain must be defended from her enemies.

The Whigs saw that both the Constitution and the Empire were threatened by 'French principles,' as now by Irish principles, and they drew together in aid of these transcendent interests. Time indeed had gradually effaced most other strongly marked lines of demarcation between Whigs of the old school and the Tories who supported Pitt, insomuch that when the scaffolding was removed it was found that a new party had risen up behind it. But a stupendous national danger was the efficient cause of the Coalition.

It is remarkable that even with his large majorities Pitt should have thought it necessary to invoke the aid of the Whigs. But his motives are pretty clear. The position which he had assumed, and the formidable confederacy which he had to face, made it expedient for him to present England to her enemies as a united nation. The work he had in hand was no work for a party, however numerous and influential. Resistance to French aggression must be a national movement. Pitt, no doubt, could have carried all his measures through Parliament by majorities of eighty or a hundred without looking beyond his own party. And if he did not think that enough for the arduous task which lay before him, what would he have thought of majorities of twenty and thirty? His object was to have a Government which not only represented the dominant feeling of Great Britain-for that he had already-but which should represent it in such overwhelming strength, that all question of majorities and minorities should disappear. If nothing less than this seemed sufficient to Mr. Pitt in resisting a revolution, nothing less would certainly have been demanded by him for the purpose of effecting one,

The Coalition of 1794 is generally quoted as the best example of such alliances, and the one by which all others may be judged. It certainly fulfils all the conditions we have named as essential to such a compact. It was prompted by a patriotic regard for the public welfare at a great national crisis, and not by any personal partialities or antipathies. It was directed to the maintenance of great principles; and it was the result of a gradually ripened unanimity on political subjects, instead of being the sudden contrivance of parliamentary groups, who see a chance of snatching office and dividing the spoil, but with no other thought or aspiration in common. Perhaps even more than the Coalition of 1835-41 has it a direct interest for us at the present day, and a practical application to the present situation of affairs.

The junction of Sir Robert Peel with the more Conservative

Whigs,

Whigs, who declined to follow the Government of 1834 in the Radical policy which Lord John Russell and Lord Althorp seemed ready to adopt, shares with the Coalition of 1794 the honour of being an example of the perfectly honest and honourable Coalition. It should be remembered that before the Reform Bill of 1832 reformers like Brougham, John Russell, and Romilly were all pure Whigs, acknowledging no affinity with the Radicals. The changes at which they aimed did not go beyond mechanical improvements, leaving the framework and main organs of the Constitution untouched; and many of these changes had already been taken up and carved out by Lord Liverpool's Government, which, under the guidance of Peel, Huskisson, and Canning, showed itself ready and willing to accomplish all which the moderate Liberals really wanted. It is pretty certain that, down to 1830, even Parliamentary Reform was not a party question with the Whigs. On the Irish question, and the Church question, they were divided against themselves. Mr. Tierney, when leader of the Opposition, told Lord Russell that Reform could not be made a party question. But after 1832 it became apparent that they were being drawn on into measures of such a nature as to throw into the shade all the questions on which Peel and Stanley disagreed. Stanley remained for some time undecided, fearing the possible ascendency of the 'top-boot Tories,' as they were called, who might prove, he thought, too strong for the Tamworth Conservatives, who wore trousers like their leader. After his resignation on the Irish Church question in May 1834, he may have brooded for a time over the possibility of constructing a middle party to be led by himself, consisting of the dissentient Whigs and more advanced Tories, elbowing both the top-boots and the white hats to the right and left. 'He did not at all events wish to close the door against all reconciliation with his former colleagues till he had seen something more of the policy of the Conservative party. With Peel Lord Stanley could have acted cordially from the first. But he was not so sure either of the Duke or of the rank and file, and he had no fancy for being shipwrecked with a reactionary section, to the ruin of his future prospects.' * On the formation of Sir Robert Peel's Government in 1834, Stanley promised him an independent support, and assigned his reasons for not accepting office in a letter which is a locus classicus on the history of Coalitions. He thought, and thought rightly, that his secession from the Whigs would lose half its moral effect upon the public if it was

^{* &#}x27;Life of Lord Derby,' by T. E. Kebbel, p. 60.

open to the suspicion of having been influenced in the slightest degree by the expectation of office with the Conservatives. He thought also that time should be obtained for the points of agreement between himself and the Conservatives to become more fixed and more prominent in the public mind than they could be in the winter of 1834, while old differences of opinion should pari passu recede into the background. He understood, in a word, the danger and the impolicy of sudden and abrupt coalition. After some years of independent support his accession to the Conservative Cabinet of 1841 seemed the most natural thing in the world, and jarred on no man's sense of political purity or consistency.

This coalition was effected then without a spark of personal feeling intermingling with it, exclusively on public grounds, and in deference to conscientious convictions. It at once arrested the too rapid progress of revolutionary ideas which followed the Reform Bill, and had so powerful and lasting an effect that they never raised their head again with the slightest prospect of success for more than a quarter of a century. And, oddly enough, it is this very same quarter of a century which Mr. Gladstone has picked out as the period in which Parliamentary Government in England shows to the greatest

We hope we have now achieved with reasonable success the task which we imposed upon ourselves at the beginning of this article, and have shown wherein consists the difference between honourable and discreditable coalitions, and what it is which has acquired for this species of political transaction a somewhat evil reputation. We have shown that there have been some which England did love, and which have exercised a salutary and lasting effect upon her fortunes. The great points, the notes of a healthy Coalition, are first that it should be formed for the sake of great principles, or else for the sake of public safety, not for the purpose of gratifying either personal prejudices or personal ambition; secondly, that it should be the result of a gradual approximation of opinions; and thirdly, that both parties should have tested by experience the possibility of their acting together on the great public questions of the day. Hastily-formed alliances, like those of 1783 and 1852, where there is no real agreement at bottom, must necessarily end in failure, and England rightly does not love them. Wellconsidered combinations, like those of 1794 and 1835, are both useful and honourable, and may at times be indispensable.

The present situation of political parties resembles in all essential respects both the situation of a hundred years ago and

1

1

I

the situation of sixty years ago. It can scarcely be doubted that what Lord Stanhope says of a section of the Whig party at the first of these two periods-namely, 'that they secretly sympathised with Burke, but felt a natural repugnance to break with their real chief'-was equally true of another section of them in 1834, and again during the period of Mr. Gladstone's second Administration, from 1880 to 1886. It will be within the recollection of our readers that during the progress of the general election of 1880, the prevailing impression was that, if the result was adverse to Lord Beaconsfield, a moderate Liberal Government would be formed under either Lord Granville or Lord Hartington on the basis of what has since become an historical phrase, 'plain Whig principles.' Without raking up again the various rumours which were afloat at that time concerning the manner in which the new Administration came into existence, it is sufficient to repeat that the Ministry formed by Mr. Gladstone, and the programme by which it was accompanied, were not what had been anticipated by a very large class of voters who contributed to turn out Lord Beaconsfield. It may also be remembered that Mr. Goschen's unwillingness to agree to the extension of the county franchise, disabling him from taking office under his old leader, was held to have a significance of its own beyond the particular question which was the immediate ground of disagreement.

The conduct of affairs by the new Government did not tend to weaken the dissatisfaction of the public with the disappointment of their earlier expectations. It is unnecessary to say anything of the Egyptian war or other blunders of a like nature, which, however much they disgusted the public, were not of that particular quality which is held to justify the rupture of party ties. The Irish policy of the Government more nearly approached that character; nor is it any secret that the Kilmainham compact was viewed with deep regret by many of Mr. Gladstone's adherents, and even by some of his colleagues. Loyalty to party is a distinctive Whig doctrine, and Lord Hartington was only acting in accordance with it when he stood by Mr. Gladstone to the last. But we know from Lord Hartington's own mouth what he felt about his own position, and the duty and functions of the great party which he represented. He believed that they had still a most important office to discharge in the economy of the Constitution; and that it was still their mission to hold the balance between reaction and revolution, and to ensure the safety and finality of progressive legislation by guarding it against popular precipitancy. these thoughts were in his mind seven or eight years ago, it is not likely that they then occurred to him for the first time. It is almost a moral certainty that he must for some years have been growing conscious that his own relations with Radicalism were becoming strained, and that any further advances in that direction, especially if the result of pressure from without, would compel him to reconsider his position. That, as Mr. Gladstone's Radicalism became more pronounced, the alienation of a section of the Whigs was eventually to be expected, is a pro-

position which hardly requires to be enforced.

But there was more than this. We have plain evidence of that antecedent approximation of opinion which we have enumerated as one of the notes of a legitimate Coalition. Lord Hartington said in 1886 that he had no doubt of being able to co-operate with Lord Salisbury, but that he was not so sure of the rank and file. Is not just this what Lord Derby felt in 1835 about Sir Robert Peel and the Conservatives, and had ceased to feel in 1841? During the last ten years there has been no particular individual singled out for attack; the new formation which parties have been gradually assuming has been dictated by principle or policy, not by personal animosity; and the two political connexions which seem now tending towards a fusion have had ample experience of each other, and, if they joined hands, would be under no necessity of keeping their hearts in the background.

These conditions, we say, have been ripening ever since 1880. Plain Whig principles were then thrown over. But both in Parliament and out of it a few plain Whigs still remained—a dour race—who, like Burke, bided their time. The death of Lord Beaconsfield made a coalition more possible, and what has occurred during the last seven years seems to have rendered it a certainty. Such a coalition as this would not be only a Parliamentary Coalition, it would be a national coalition. An anti-Radical party has been gradually growing up in the country, frightened as it well may be by attacks on the Constitution and the Empire which have already taken place, and by the further attacks on property and liberty with which we are immediately threatened. Considering the leaps and bounds by which the Radical demands have advanced since the support of that party became necessary to Mr. Gladstone, it is only natural that many Englishmen and Scotchmen who have hitherto ranked as Liberals should begin to consider whether, by remaining in line with that connexion, they are not in danger of being dragged into measures which they never contemplated, and of which they heartily disapprove. They will see, however, that if they throw off the Radicals they cannot stand alone, or form a party by themselves capable of upholding

f

0

upholding administrative and social progress against violent organic change; and to whom can they look for help so well as to that party with whom they have acted now for seven years in perfect harmony and agreement? That the bulk of the Conservative party would receive such adherents with open arms has already been demonstrated. A few might stand aloof and constitute, according to custom, the extreme wing of the party, priding themselves on never having touched anything common or unclean; but the great majority of Conservatives who supported Lord Salisbury from 1886 to 1892, would continue to support him at the head of such a party as we have

suggested.

The party system at the present day has shifted from its original basis. It formerly rested on the supposition that there were two parties in the country differing from each other on methods of government, not on the value of institutions which both parties alike accepted. These parties might be called upon in turn to administer public affairs in accordance with these methods; or, in face of any grave public emergency or national danger when these systems were not brought into conflict, to combine together for the common safety; but neither party was required to be continually engaged in legislation, in making new laws, or amending or repealing old ones. Now that every Government in turn is expected to busy itself in this manner, while differences about Parliament and prerogative have long been dormant, the distinction between Whig and Tory, or, if it is thought better, between Liberal and Conservative, has become one of degree rather than of kind, and the real antagonism has been transferred to a different arena. It now lies between the friends of the Constitution on the one hand and the party of organic change on the other, which had no existence when the system of party first came into being. Thus for some years past parties have been in a false position, which, unfortunately, it has been the interest of certain statesmen to prolong. Those who were really two parties have been called one, and those who were really one party have been called two. What were the differences which separated Lord Derby from Lord Palmerston, Lord Beaconsfield from Lord Granville, Mr. Bouverie from Mr. Henley, Mr. Goschen from Sir Stafford Northcote, compared with the differences which separated all of them from men of the type of Mr. Labouchere, Mr. Conybeare, Mr. Cunningham Graham, or Mr. Channing? But the Liberal section of what ought to have been recognized as the National Constitutional Party, wishing for a monopoly of power, was obliged, generally speaking, to rely on Radical support; and it

may be willingly conceded that, down at all events to 1869. they bought it cheap. The solemn farce was kept up of calling these two discordant sections 'the great Liberal Party,' and Heaven only knows how much longer it might have been kept up had not Home Rule suddenly exploded in the middle of it and shattered the imposture. The exigencies of the Irish question have thrown so much power into the hands of the Radicals, and the assumed necessity for continual legislation gives them so many opportunities of exerting it, that they are no longer to be had upon the old terms; and a large number of Liberals, both in Parliament and out of it, who were parties to the former bargain, have begun to look askance at the new one, and to feel that the Radical alliance may be bought too dear. Progressive reform, as we have already stated, is a question of degree; and if such men by joining the Conservatives find that they can defeat Radical extortion without being required to abandon the path of social development, they may, and probably soon will, reconstitute parties upon a natural and intelligible basis.

The difference between Radical and Liberal being now one of principle, while that between Liberal and Conservative is only one of detail, the logical result can hardly be very long delayed. It being conceded as an undeniable proposition that, after the changes which have recently taken place in the distribution of political power, it is useless for any party in the country to assume a non possumus attitude towards popular demands; and that these, when once clearly defined, and seen to rest on convictions likely to be permanent, must be met by measures interfering as little as possible with our existing order, this being granted, then it would seem that a coalition such as we are contemplating would consist of exactly the right materials for such a task; would constitute exactly the very party demanded by the public opinion of the country. If politics is the science of compromise, it is a truth on which all practical statesmen must be prepared to act; and both Conservative and Liberal Unionists must have pretty nearly fathomed each other's views by this time on all the great questions of the day, and have satisfied themselves that no very alarming sacrifice will be required of either, whenever the fusion is effected.

Parties, like everything else in this world, are subject to the law of corruption and generation; and from the gradual decay of pure Whiggism and stationary Toryism springs the Constitutional party of the future. It was by this process that the great party which we always associate with the name of William Pitt, first came into being. Such was the origin of the Conser-

vative

vative party at the beginning of the present century; and by the same natural and spontaneous readjustment of forces will be erected another great barrier against social and political revolution.

With regard to the actual crisis which confronts us at the present moment, something more is to be said. If Mr. Pitt denounced the coalition between Fox and North as 'unnatural,' still more justly may we apply that epithet to the coalition between Mr. Sexton and Mr. Gladstone. It is a union between politicians divided from each other by generic differences, and moral and intellectual antipathies which have nothing approaching to a parallel in the distinction between Liberal and Conservative. The alliance is monstrous, and has been met by another the parties to which, whatever varieties of opinion may have prevailed among them on other subjects, have never been at issue with regard to the Constitution and the Empire. The resemblance, however, between the redistribution of forces which occurred in 1827, when we also saw a Coalition against a Coalition, and that which has recently taken place, is very slight, and any real precedent for Mr. Gladstone's conduct is to be sought much further back in our political history. In some respects the situation of to-day is not unlike that of 1783. Then as now the Coalition Government introduced and carried through the House of Commons a Bill which would certainly have deranged the balance of the Constitution. The House of Lords rejected it; and the Government did not resign. So far the circumstances are alike; and it may be that the public would be well satisfied, should the parallel not end here, Mr. Gladstone has brought us into a predicament from which neither he himself nor any one else can deliver us but by a choice of evils; and we are by no means sure that the exercise of the royal prerogative to ensure a prompt appeal to the constituencies would not be the least of them. Whatever justification existed for the intervention of her Majesty's grandfather on the occasion to which we have referred exists in more abundance now. Great as was the danger with which we were then threatened, we are now threatened with a greater. Sure as George III. may have felt of the support of his people, the Queen might be surer still. We are face to face with a crisis such as has often been predicted by those who have calculated the more remote consequences of the Reform Bill of 1832. Before the passing of that measure ministerial absolutism was doubly provided against, -first by the authority of the Crown; and secondly, by the existence of the nomination boroughs. It was never intended

by the British Constitution that any one branch of the Government should be supreme over the rest, or be able to set at defiance the Crown, the House of Lords, and the public opinion of Great Britain. Whether the House of Commons ought to possess such powers is a speculative question of the highest interest. But it is not a practical one. The Constitution has already decided it; and when the nomination boroughs were swept away, nothing remained to give effect to this theory against a Minister resolved to disregard it, but the power still lodged in the Crown of appealing directly to the people. That this power should be kept in reserve for disorders of exceptional acuteness nobody will deny: the question is whether we are not in face of such a crisis now, and whether any better plan can be suggested for compelling the Prime Minister to loosen his grasp on the throat of our parliamentary liberties, and to submit himself to the judgment of the people, than the one adopted by the Sovereign a hundred and ten years ago.

In dismissing the Whig Ministry in 1834, William IV. was only nominally following the example of his father. There were no signs at that time that public opinion was hostile to the policy of the Government. There had been no coalition between parties in the position of logical contradictories outraging the moral sense of the whole nation. There had been no attempt to destroy the freedom of Parliament by a measure which should place a band of unscrupulous swordsmen at the command of the Prime Minister. The circumstances were entirely different; and that William IV. failed where George III. succeeded, is only saying that he mistook the nature of the

situation, and was misled by superficial analogies.

We have observed that the resemblance between the situation of to-day and that of 1783 is only partial. For a closer approximation to it we must look back for nearly another century. What is demanded by the peril which at present overhangs us is not so much a coalition of parties as an uprising of the whole nation against a policy of violence as unconstitutional, as tyrannical, and as dangerous to both civil and religious liberty as anything attempted by James II. The ultimate issue of Home Rule, the prospect which alone gives it any real hold upon the Irish people, is the aggrandizement of the Roman Church, and its probable establishment in Ireland. Such was the object of James II.; and he attempted to gain his ends under the mask of religious Liberalism. It is the Irish priesthood who hold the key of the situation. It is they who brought about the disestablishment of the Irish Church. It is they who have have compassed the pauperization and expropriation of the Irish gentry; and it is the same influence which is now bent on destroying the authority of the Imperial Parliament. 'Amidst the discordant activity of many factions moves the supreme purpose of one Power.' And England and Great Britain may rely upon it that Home Rule, in the only practical sense of the words, and in the eyes of those who alone are capable of sustaining the movement in support of it, is only another blow struck for Roman Catholic ascendency, the natural sequence to the Acts of 1869 and 1870, and the supplementary legislation which has followed. The Romish priesthood are the masters of Ireland; and the servants of the Romish priesthood, in the event of Home Rule being carried, would be the masters of England. There is the peril against which the Unionist alliance was originally formed, and the Coalition must ripen into a

fusion if the foe is to be finally defeated.

If Mr. Gladstone really believes that the constituencies are in favour of the Home Rule Bill which the House of Lords has rejected, why not appeal to them at once? If he sees any conflict between the House of Lords and the will of the people, why not afford the people the earliest possible opportunity of declaring their mind upon the subject? On Mr. Gladstone's hypothesis every minute's delay in the dissolution of the present Parliament is an injury to the nation. Not only have the electors a right to demand that they shall not be kept suffering under the veto of the House of Lords without entering their protest against it a moment longer than is necessary, the Lords themselves are entitled to know at as early a date as possible whether their decision is agreeable to public feeling or not. But Mr. Gladstone 'fears his fate too much.' He knows that the last corrupt compact between himself and the enemies of England must necessarily belong to that class of Coalitions which England does not love. He knows that it is hopeless to inflame the British people against the House of Lords merely because they have baffled this nefarious confederacy; and we may be certain therefore that dissolve he will not as long as there is a plank left between himself and destruction. speech at Edinburgh, replete with impotent malice, plainly reveals his own consciousness of weakness. It is folly to talk of the House of Lords being on its trial now more than at any other time. It has always been upon its trial through the whole period which Mr. Gladstone traverses; and the fact that it is stronger at the end of it than it was at the beginning, does not say much for the solidity of Mr. Gladstone's rhetoric.

ART. X.—1. Parliamentary Debates. Session 1893.

2. Speech of the Rt. Hon. W. E. Gladstone in Edinburgh, Sept. 27, 1893.

COME years ago, John Bright dubbed the Conservatives the 'stupid party.' If that true-hearted, though somewhat wrong-headed, Englishman had lived to the present time, we doubt whether he would have considered the epithet equally appropriate. It is a comfort to those who, in common with ourselves, while disagreeing with his principles in many ways, yet respected and honoured that sturdy, outspoken champion of the people's cause, to reflect that, in his later years, he joined heart and soul with his old opponents in upholding the cause of the Union, as soon as that cause was threatened by the desertion of the Liberals. No man would have been more prompt to denounce the confusion of mind, the disregard of common-sense, the inability to follow any logical chain of reasoning, the lack of perception that assertion is one thing and argument another, which have characterised the Gladstonian defence of an untenable position. In politics, as in religion, if once you accept the dogma of infallibility, there is an end of discussion. If whatever Mr. Gladstone asserts must be right, all controversy as to the truth or falsehood of any particular assertion is obviously futile. Roma locuta est; and there is an end of the matter.

From a theological point of view there is much to be said for the theory of infallibility; from a political point of view, there is nothing to be pleaded, except that it saves trouble and avoids mental exertion. Any party, therefore, which gives up its conscience into the keeping of an autocratic Minister, not only deserves to be called stupid, but We have had of late, in our own tends to become stupid. experience, an instance of the kind of fatuous imbecility which has characterised the Liberal party since it surrendered the right of private judgment. In our last number, there appeared an article on Professor Dicey's 'A Leap in the Dark.' Nobody. we should have thought, gifted with the most rudimentary intelligence could have read the article in question without realizing that, whether the arguments employed were sound or unsound, their whole aim and purport was to vindicate the action of the Unionists, and to condemn, not only the policy of Home Rule in itself, but the tactics by which that policy was upheld. Mr. Gladstone, however, arrived at the conclusion that our article ought to be interpreted in what we may call a non-natural sense. He gave utterance to the opinion that the article was

0

to

h

le

n

our

one of the utmost importance; was, in fact, an 'epoch-making' document, on the assumption that the line of argument adopted by us abandoned the chief grounds of the Unionist case, displayed fundamental divergences of opinion between the Conservatives and Liberal Unionists, and indicated an intention on the part of the Conservative party to adopt Home Rule as their own policy in the event of their return to Our satisfaction at the terms in which the Prime Minister had expressed himself as to the merits of the article in question was diminished by the conviction that the approbation was ludicrously undeserved. We knew very well what we had meant to write; and a careful reperusal of what we had written convinced us, as it would have convinced any man of ordinary understanding, that our words could convey no other meaning than the one we had intended to convey. shadow of justification we could discover for Mr. Gladstone's assertions was that we had expressed a doubt as to the practical utility of the 'Referendum,' that we did not attach quite the same importance to the judgment of the Parnell Commission as is assigned to it by some of the Liberal Unionists, and that we admitted that, supposing the next General Election should result contrary to our hope and belief, in the return of a Gladstonian majority pledged to Home Rule, the position of the House of Lords would not be the same as it is at present. Whether we were right or wrong in these opinions is not the question. All we assert is, that their expression is utterly inadequate to justify a deduction which was in flagrant and startling contradiction to every other line of the article. The interpretation arbitrarily placed upon our words by Mr. Gladstone is only another illustration of his marvellous faculty of believing whatever it suits his purpose to believe. A refusal to admit that there is anything to be said on the other side of any question upon which he has formed his own opinion, is so characteristic of Mr. Gladstone, that he is unable to understand the attitude of mind which, while holding firmly to a certain conclusion, is yet able to recognize the weight of the considerations bearing against this conclusion. Moreover, common justice compels us to add that Mr. Gladstone has always sought to attribute to his opponents an equal readiness with himself to change their opinions in accordance with the exigencies of the hour. He is well aware that his one chance of succeeding in his Home Rule policy lies in the possibility of some split between the Conservatives and the Liberal Unionists, and, with this knowledge present to his mind, it was only in accordance with his mental structure that he should endeavour to persuade himself that Vol. 177.-No. 354.

our article furnished proof presumptive that the Conservatives ntended to outbid the Liberals by taking up Home Rule.

As for Mr. Gladstone, we, in common with the rest of the world who are not victims to the Gladstonian delusion, have long ago given up the attempt to reconcile any statement he may make with facts or truth; but we confess that we were astonished at the credulity with which this attempt on the part of their leader to fasten on us an imputation for which there was neither rhyme nor reason, was taken up by his followers. Yet, forthwith, the Gladstonian press, both in the metropolis and the provinces, published a series of articles couched in almost the same language, and obviously deriving their inspiration from the same quarter, all declaring that our article was a proof that the Conservatives knew that Home Rule was inevitable, and intended to appropriate to themselves the advantage of carrying it into effect. The charge is too baseless, too flimsy to require further notice in itself. We allude to it solely in order to show the degree of imbecility attained under Mr. Gladstone's influence by latterday Liberalism. Having said this, let us pass on to the more congenial task of examining how far the events of the three months which have elapsed since the article under notice appeared in print, tend to confirm the view that the Conservatives are disheartened, feel that they are losing ground, are dissatisfied with their Liberal Unionist allies, or, above all. contemplate the contingency of an ignominious desertion of the Unionist cause, saw ability northable a

Up to the latter part of June the Home Rule Bill had been carried forward by the ordinary process of legislation. By that date, however, it had become clear that the Bill could only be passed in time to be sent up to the Lords before the close of the Session, provided the Government consented to abandon all other business and to concentrate their whole energies on the measure for the Repeal of the Union. Such a measure was surely great enough, whether for evil or for good, to justify the postponement of all other legislation, and Mr. Gladstone would probably have preferred, if he had consulted only his own wishes, to devote himself exclusively to the magnum opus of his career, the undoing of the Act of Union, consecrated as it is by the genius of Pitt. Unfortunately, party considerations stood in his way. The Bill was certain to be thrown out by the Lords on the unanswerable ground that it had neither been submitted to, nor accepted by, the constituencies of the United Kingdom. In such a case, dissolution became almost imperative Even Mr. Gladstone's ingenuity could not devise an excuse for post-

poning an early appeal to the country on the rejection of a measure which the Ministry had made the one item of their programme, and to which they had confined the work of the Session. At the same time the leaders of the Liberal party, both in and out of the House, were unanimously of opinion that, if the Government went to the country on Home Rule alone, they would be courting a certain and disastrous defeat. The one chance of getting a renewal of their 'mandate' from the constituencies was in their judgment to follow the example of the nurses of our childhood, and to induce the electorate to swallow the drug of Home Rule against which their palate revolted, by covering it over with all sorts of sweets, supposed to be attractive to the populace. But in order to provide these sweets, it was essential to have time for their manufacture. In other words, the Home Rule Bill had to be passed by fair means, or if not by foul, at such a date as to allow of the Ministry securing the time requisite in their opinion to bring forward measures other than Home Rule, which might induce the constituencies to return a Liberal majority at the next elections. The Radicals, the Liberationists, and the Local Optionists were prepared to pay any price necessary to obtain a prolongation of office for the only Ministry likely to carry out their ideas; the Home Rulers were favourable to any measures that annoyed the Unionists and humiliated the Imperial Parliament; and Mr. Gladstone had long ago convinced himself that his remaining in power was a supreme duty, and that, therefore, any means requisite to advance this end were worthy of adoption. As usual, when a question arose between principle and interest, he discovered that the promotion of his own interest was a matter of principle; and thus it came to pass that the statesman, the whole glory of whose life was associated with Parliamentary Government, consented to deal a mortal blow at the freedom of Parliamentary debate. In order if possible to carry out some fragments of the Newcastle programme, before going to the country, the Premier decided to cut short the discussion on Home Rule by the use of the Closure; and his decision was at once accepted by his submissive followers.

From that day, the debate on Home Rule became a sort of make-believe business. The time allowed for discussing the four batches of Clauses was manifestly and even ludicrously inadequate. Even supposing that there had been good faith on both sides, not days, but weeks, or months were required to discuss properly a number of grave constitutional questions affecting all the institutions not only of Ireland but of the United Kingdom. In the end, these questions were, in the

great majority of instances, decided in dumb show, for not a word was uttered, or was even permitted to be uttered, either for or against them. When once the Government had adopted the system of legislation by compartments, it was obvious this must be so. In consequence, discussion under the Closure became a sheer mockery. It would be about as reasonable to ask a condemned criminal with his head on the block to state in full the reasons why he should not be punished for the crime of which he stood convicted, if at the same time the guillotine was ordered to fall within four seconds of his commencing his defence. It was a mere waste of breath to argue against the Bill, in as far as any immediate result was concerned; and if the Opposition had resolved to quit the House as soon as the Closure was put into operation, their conduct, though open to question, as a matter of policy, would logically have been unassailable. The oddest part of the whole affair is that the Government never even attempted to place on record any defence of an innovation which in itself is opposed to every principle and theory of Parliamentary rule. In all constitutional countries the people are supposed to be governed by the vote of the majority of their elected representatives, after these representatives have discussed the measures submitted to their consideration. This supposition is set at nought, if the majority are to decide without even hearing the objections of the minority. There is one line of argument only which can justify the introduction of the Closure; and that line is, that the measure under consideration has already been fully discussed, that it commends itself to the general approval of the House, and that its immediate enactment is a matter of urgent public interest. But Mr. Gladstone himself was not prepared to argue that, even if Home Rule was desirable, the question whether it would be granted a few weeks earlier or later was of pressing importance. The one defence put forward in justification of the Closure was that the Conservatives had employed it to pass a Bill of their own; and that, therefore, the Liberals were justified in using it in order to expedite legislation to which they stood committed. The tu quoque argument is a poor one at the best, but in the present instance it was even feebler than usual. The Crimes Act was a measure that had been accepted and endorsed by Liberals and Conservatives alike; the opposition to it was confined to a small and avowedly factious minority; and, above all, it was an Act which, if it was to be passed at all, had, in the interest of law and order, to be passed at once. No single one of these considerations could be urged on behalf of silencing discussion on the Home Rule Bill. Sic volo, sic jubeo, was the one real plea the Ministry and their adherents adherents could urge in favour of the Closure. The constituencies, they said in effect, have given us a bare majority; we intend to use that majority in order to force through a measure to which an enormous minority are absolutely hostile, and to which the larger portion of the majority are avowedly indifferent. This is the contention that Mr. Gladstone was not ashamed to advocate, and which the Liberal party had the audacity to support. By the adoption of this policy, government by show of hands has been substituted for government by force of argument; and whenever the Conservatives are again in power, it may prove difficult for them not to employ the weapon that the Liberals have placed in their hands. Those who, in common with ourselves, set principle above party, cannot but be aware that tolerance of differences of opinion has been the secret of England's success as a constitutional country; and even if we could agree with the estimate placed by his admirers on Mr. Gladstone's services, we should feel that these services were more than counterbalanced by the blow he has dealt in his old age to the Parliamentary system under which Great Britain has attained her present prosperity, has secured her existing liberties, and has earned for herself the title of being the Champion of Parliamentary Government.

Even after it became clear that the debate on Home Rule was henceforward to be a sham fight, the Opposition made up their minds to avail themselves of the illusory opportunities afforded them of amending a Bill that, in their judgment, ought not to be passed at all. In so deciding, we think they showed good sense and sound judgment. A policy of obstruction does not commend itself to the British public. The Unionist Members were sent to Parliament to oppose the Repeal of the Union, and, if they failed in that, to render this repeal as little hurtful as possible to public interests. The fact of their having proved powerless, so far as the House of Commons is concerned, to discharge the first part of their mandate, did not relieve them from the duty of doing their utmost to discharge the second part. How well they fulfilled this duty, and how utterly they failed to meet with any response on the part of the Liberal party, is shown by the records of the summer Session. Let us

cite a few instances in support of our assertion.

On the 3rd of July, Lord Wolmer proposed an amendment authorizing the Lord Lieutenant to create an executive force in order to carry out any act of the Imperial Parliament affecting Ireland, or any decision of the Privy Council or the Exchequer Judges. This proposal only conferred on the representative of the Imperial Government the same powers as are entrusted to the President of the United States in order to secure the compliance of any State Government with the decisions of the Federal Power. Yet this amendment was opposed by the Ministry, as calculated to curtail the independence of the Irish Government, and was rejected by a majority of 34. On the following day, the Gladstonians defeated, by a majority of 37, Mr. Arnold Foster's amendment as modified by Lord Randolph Churchill, reserving the prerogative of mercy to the Lord Lieutenant, acting on the advice of the Imperial Government, and thereby virtually authorized the free pardon of the imprisoned dynamiters, as soon as a Nationalist Ministry comes into existence. A like fate on the same day attended Sir Henry James's suggestion that, during the sexennial period in which the Irish revenue is still to be collected by the Imperial authorities, the Irish Executive should remain unaltered. On the 6th of July, Lord Wolmer moved that the Lord Lieutenant should be allowed, on his own initiative, to exercise the power of veto on any Bills passed by the Irish Parliament, and should not be obliged to act on the advice of his Irish Ministers, Mr. Gladstone opposed the suggestion; the Closure was put in force; and the principle was laid down by a majority of 42 that the Viceroy must follow the advice of his Irish Ministers, in the same way as the Sovereign pays heed to the counsels of the Imperial Ministry.

Again, on the 12th of July, an effort was made by Mr. Parker Smith to save Dublin University from disfranchisement. The Members for the University are virtually returned by the graduates of Trinity College, Dublin; and the historic claims of this noble institution are outweighed in Nationalist judgment by the fact that, as representing the culture, the learning, and the intelligence of Ireland, it has always been a stronghold of the Irish loyalists. Mr. Gladstone as a scholar, and as the sometime representative of Oxford, might have been expected to stand up for the parliamentary privileges of the great Irish College. The Home Rulers, however, attached special value to the disfranchisement of Dublin University, not on account of its intrinsic importance, but on account of their desire to inflict a humiliation on the English Mr. Gladstone was obliged to obey the orders of his Nationalist allies, and made a strong speech against Mr. Parker Smith's amendment, which was rejected by a majority of 32. In the same way, the Government resisted any proposal made with a view to protect the civil servants of Ireland from harsh or illiberal treatment on the part of their new masters. The fidelity with which these officials have

served

served the Imperial Government in the past, and the certainty that they will not sympathise with Nationalist ideas in the future, have rendered them obnoxious to the Separatist party. In these circumstances, no knowledge of human nature, and still less of Irish nature, is required to tell us that every effort will be made under the new régime to render impossible the retention of their offices by the present officials in the public service, and thus to compel them to retire on inadequate terms of compensation. If there is one body of Irishmen who have special claims on the protection of any British Ministry, they are the Civil Servants of the Crown in the sister kingdom. But Mr. Gladstone turned a deaf ear to every suggestion to secure them fair play and liberal treatment, and they were left to the tender mercies of their old enemies, whose first care will be to fill the public service with nominees

and supporters of their own.

After having supported the disfranchisement of Irish education, the irony of fate compelled the Ministry to protest against the disfranchisement of Irish ignorance. On the 7th of August it was proposed to exclude illiterate voters from the franchise in Ireland. Common sense would suffice to show that, even under the most democratic system, a man unable to write his own name is not qualified to exercise the franchise. In Ireland, not only is the number of genuine illiterates out of all proportion to that found in other parts of the United Kingdom; but there, and there only, are to be found large bodies of what we may call 'artificial illiterates.' It is matter of common notoriety that when the parish priests, who are the agents of the Home Rule party, entertain any suspicion that one of their flock may take advantage of the ballot to vote against the candidate of the clergy, they compel him to declare himself illiterate, so that his vote has to be given under the inspection of the priests, who take up their stand at the polling booths while the voting is going on. In this way, the protection of the ballot is removed; and the priests are masters of the political situation. Mr. Parker Smith's amendment proposed on Aug. 7 would have removed this flagrant abuse; but the Gladstonians would not listen to any proposal which might weaken the electoral strength of their Nationalist confederates; and the doctrine that, in Liberal opinion, illiteracy is no disqualification for the franchise was affirmed by a majority of 43.

Nor did the Irish landlords receive any fairer treatment. Whatever may have been the shortcomings of the Irish gentry in the past, they, in common with every other class of Her Majesty's subjects, have a right to be protected against oppres-

sion in the present; and the duty of so protecting them is more incumbent on Mr. Gladstone and his colleagues than even on a Conservative Administration, owing to the simple fact that the landowners have entered into their present arrangements with their tenants on the faith of Mr. Gladstone's Land Act. The Prime Minister has himself recognized this obligation-in words-and even Mr. John Morley went out of his way only a few years ago to acknowledge that the question of the relations between landlords and tenants in Ireland could not fairly or honourably be left to the sole arbitrament of a Home Rule Parliament. Yet, when it came to practice, not to words, both Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Morley left the Irish landlords in the lurch. Under the Bill, Land Commissioners are to be appointed in Ireland to settle any questions that may arise between landlord and tenant. If these Commissioners are appointed by the Home Rulers, they will infallibly be men who hold the Home Rule theory—that landlords must be thankful for anything their tenants may choose to pay them, and that prairie value ought by rights to be the standard by which land in Ireland is calculated, so far, at least, as the English owners are concerned. On the 14th of August, Mr. Carson proposed to guard to some slight extent against this monstrous injustice, by providing that the appointment of the Irish Land Commissioners should rest in the hands of the Imperial Government. But, in spite of all their professions, the Ministry would not hear of anything that might give umbrage to the Nationalist susceptibilities, and the House decided by a majority of 35 that in all questions between landlords and tenants in Ireland, the tenants should, in fact though not in name, be judges in their own cause.

If the landed interest was thrown over by the Ministry as a sop to the Separatists, it was hardly to be expected that commercial or constitutional interests should fare any better at their hands. Mr. V. Gibbs, speaking with the high authority of a City magnate, appealed to the Government on the 17th of August to include Bills of Exchange in the list of subjects with which the Irish Parliament should be precluded from dealing. To Mr. Gladstone, as a financier, the extreme importance of uniformity of legislation in monetary matters must have been specially patent. Nor could the Nationalists reasonably complain of being deprived of powers not conceded to the sovereign States under the American Constitution. But the proposed restriction was distasteful to the Nationalists, and therefore Mr. Gladstone and his followers rejected it by a majority of 34.

It

It is difficult to attribute relative degrees of stability to the opinions held by a politician whose whole public career has been an illustration of the art of modifying opinions so as to suit the exigencies of his policy. Still, if there was one article of his political creed to which Mr. Gladstone, since he became a Liberal, has adhered with apparently genuine conviction and sincerity, it has been the doctrine of Free Trade. Now, if there is one thing certain about the future of Ireland under a Home Rule Parliament, it is that an attempt, probably a successful attempt, will be made to develop native industries by a system of Protection. The first act of an independent Irish Parliament would be to celebrate the union of hearts by excluding British goods from Irish markets. The adoption of a Protective tariff by Ireland, which would still in name—and, as the Liberals contend, in fact—remain part of the United Kingdom, might possibly commend itself to Mr. Gladstone's approval, as affording wholesome discipline to England; but it must, one would have thought, have received his stern condemnation, as constituting the severest blow to the principles of Free Trade, the propagation of which throughout the civilized world is, according to the orthodox Liberal faith, the first and chief duty of the United Kingdom. Yet, when an effort was made to avert this peril, Mr. Gladstone and the Liberals were found ready to throw over Free Trade sooner than offend their Nationalist associates. On the 18th of August, Mr. Hobhouse proposed to prohibit the Irish Parliament from giving, by way of bounties or otherwise, any preference to Irish industries, which would afford them an artificial advantage, as compared with similar industries in other parts of the United Kingdom. But this proposal was ruled out of court by the Ministry, as calculated to wound the susceptibilities of their allies, and was defeated by a majority of 45. Again, on the 21st of August, an amendment was moved by Mr. Parker Smith, precluding the Irish Parliament from passing Bills of Attainder or ex post facto laws. This amendment was defended on the ground that it reproduced one of the limitations imposed by the American Constitution on the legislative powers of the sovereign States. It was attacked on the ground that it was a libel on the Irish nation even to contemplate the possibility of their Parliament resorting to such weapons as Acts of Attainder or ex post facto legislation in order to pay off old scores or to redress bygone grievances; and the principle of unlimited confidence in the good faith of the Irish Nationalists was affirmed by a majority of 41.

On the 25th of August, the eve of the debate on the report being brought to a summary termination by the Closure, Mr. Hanbury made a final effort to secure for the Imperial Parliament some kind of control or supervision over the action of the Irish Legislature, by proposing that, in the event of the Bill becoming law, there should still be included among her Majesty's Ministers an Irish Secretary of State, to whom questions could be addressed, and by whom information might be furnished on all matters concerning the action of the Irish Legislature. A more reasonable proposal could hardly be made, if any real effect was to be given to the repeated assertions of the Ministry that, under Home Rule in Ireland, the supremacy of the Imperial Parliament over all portions of the United Kingdom is to remain supreme and unimpaired. Even in the case of those Colonies to which we have gradually granted absolute autonomy in the management of their own internal concerns, we still retain a Secretary of State for the Colonies as the official exponent—we know of no better word—of the relations between England and her dependencies. The supervision, slight as it is, which the Imperial Parliament exercises over the Colonial Legislatures by the fact of there being in our Parliament a Minister expressly responsible for the conduct of Colonial affairs, was deemed by Mr. Gladstone and his colleagues to be an assertion of the Imperial supremacy to which Ireland could not reasonably be expected to submit; and the motion was accordingly rejected by a majority of 53.

We have dwelt at some length upon these amendments, which form only a small portion of those submitted to the House of Commons during the two months' debate in Committee and on report, in order to show the animus which has actuated the Ministry throughout the discussion of the Bill. There was not one of the amendments we have commented upon which was not reasonable, and even necessary, if the Irish Parliament, which the Bill proposed to create, is in reality to be a subordinate Legislature, competent only to deal with local affairs. Yet each one of these amendments was resisted upon different variations of the same plea-that their enactment would curtail the authority of the Irish Parliament. The Ministry never lost an opportunity of asserting, as a matter of theory, that under the Bill the supremacy of the Imperial Parliament would remain unaltered; but whenever any attempt was made to reduce this theory to practice, the Ministry resisted the attempt, and were supported in their resistance by an unvarying party vote. The inference is obvious. Under their compact with their Nationalist supporters, they were unable to accede to any proposal proposal which went beyond the original limitations imposed by the Bill upon the powers of the Irish Parliament and Executive. Yet, at the same time, they were obliged, in order to retain the support of their English adherents, to maintain the contention that the authority of the Imperial Parliament was not jeopardized in any way by the measure. Hence, the constant and flagrant contradiction between their words and their acts.

If the truth were known, we suspect that a desire to hinder this contrast from being fully realized by the public, accounts for a good deal of the readiness with which Mr. Gladstone accepted and endorsed the demand for the adoption of the Closure. We were told by the organs of the Ministry, that the Radical Members had brought pressure to bear upon the Government and had more or less forced the hands of the Prime Minister, who personally viewed with extreme reluctance any curtailment of Parliamentary discussion. All experience, however, has shown that, in the present Parliament, Mr. Gladstone is far more important to the Radicals than the Radicals are to Mr. Gladstone. If he had chosen to put his foot down and declare that he would be no party to the enforcement of the Closure at so early a period, the Radicals would have had no choice except to submit to his decision. Mr. Gladstone gave way to the pressure of the Radicals, not because he was afraid of their secession in case of his refusal to yield, but because he was glad of any plausible excuse for yielding. He was aware that the longer and the more fully the Bill was discussed, the more apparent must become its true character, as involving a virtual surrender to the Nationalist demand for the Repeal of the Union. In order to carry on the policy he has pursued for the last seven years, of keeping the country in the dark, Mr. Gladstone resolved not only to employ the Closure, but to employ it in its most drastic form. If the sole desire of the Government had been to secure the passing of the Bill in time for it to be sent up to the House of Lords before the close of the Session, this object might have been attained by declaring that the Closure would be moved by the Government whenever the discussion on any clause or amendment had, in their opinion, been carried to an unnecessary length. Mr. Mellor might safely be relied upon, as Chairman of Committees, to exercise, at least, a favourable neutrality towards the party to whom he owes his appointment; and if, time after time, the Opposition had evinced a disposition to protract the discussion of details for mere purposes of obstruction, the demand for closure would have been granted freely in the House, and, what is more, would not have been condemned

condemned by public opinion outside the House. At any rate, the experiment of applying the Closure clause by clause, instead of by compartment, was one which would certainly have been tried in the first instance by any Minister sincerely anxious to uphold the traditions of free speech that have earned for the House of Commons the proud title of the Mother of Parliaments. Nothing of the kind was attempted; of his own free will, Mr. Gladstone adopted the principle originally laid down by Procrustes, and declared that henceforth all provisions of the Bill, short or long, important or unimportant, should be carried within a given number of days. Clauses 5 to 8 were to be discussed between June 30 and July 6; Clauses 9 to 26 between July 7 and July 13; Clauses 27 to 40 between July 14 and July 20; and all other Clauses, either those postponed at the desire of the Government, or those fresh Clauses which the Government had promised to introduce, between July 21 and 27. At 10 P.M., on each of four successive Thursdays in July, the debate on each batch of Clauses ceased automatically, and all the Clauses of the batch which had not been reached in the course of the week's debate were voted in silence, and on every occa-

sion by a strict party vote.

To show how this system worked in practice, let us take only one example. On the 6th of July, the Clauses of the Bill establishing a native Legislature in Ireland, determining the composition and construction of the Irish House of Commons, and providing for the contingency of any disagreement between the two branches of the Irish Legislature, were voted in dumb show, without a word being allowed to be said, either for or against them. It is impossible to conceive a more outrageous violation of the fundamental principles of Parliamentary Government. If measures altering the whole Constitution of the kingdom are to be passed by Parliament without its members being permitted to discuss them, one way or the other, what is the use of having a Parliament at all? Freedom of debate is the essence of Parliamentary life; and yet, according to the new system introduced by Mr. Gladstone, the right of speech is to be taken away from the chosen representatives of the country. The claim of the majority to close the mouths of the minority at its own good will and pleasure, is bad enough in itself; but what makes it worse are the grounds on which it was defended by Mr. Gladstone, as being the natural sequel of the measure carried through the House under the late Mr. W. H. Smith's leadership. United Kingdom in general, and Ireland in particular, have got on very fairly well for close upon a century under one Parliament; and even if the Act of Union ought to be repealed, it

Gladstone,

can make no practical difference whether it is repealed to-day or to-morrow, this week or next, this month or next month, in 1893 or 1894. On the other hand, it is of the utmost importance to the country that freedom of Parliamentary debate should remain unimpaired. We doubt, however, whether the mischief that Mr. Gladstone has wrought, owing to his own greed of office, his inordinate vanity, and his impatient intolerance of opposition, can ever be undone. Under a system of party government, it is not in human nature that one party should not avail itself of any excuse for protecting its own interests afforded by the example of their opponents. When once the Liberals have established the precedent that the Closure may fairly be employed, without the excuse of urgency, to carry measures whose only chance of being passed at all is by taking advantage of a scanty, precarious, and artificial majority, it is idle to suppose that the Conservatives, when they return to power, will not be tempted to employ the same system in order to carry out their own policy. We hope they may resist the temptation; but to us, as to anyone acquainted with the conditions of party conflict, hope in such a matter must be stronger than belief. Critics of Mr. Gladstone's career have often before now expressed their conviction that his reputation, in times to come, will suffer from not being identified with any great measure of constructive statesmanship. The believers in his posthumous fame may now console themselves by the reflection that in future days his name will be individually associated with two great achievements of destructive statecraft—the Repeal of the Union and the degradation of Parliament.

On the 30th of June, Mr. Gladstone assured the House that, in respect of the retention of the Irish Members in the Imperial Parliament, the Ministry adhered to the so-called 'in and out' scheme. If this scheme had been carried out, the Irish Members would, in theory at any rate, not have been allowed to vote or speak on questions which only concerned Great Britain. In practice, it would have been almost impossible to decide which questions concerned Great Britain alone, without in any way affecting Ireland. Still, this was a matter which could only be decided by experience; and if Mr. Gladstone had stuck to the 'in and out' project, he would have been entitled to say that he had fulfilled his pledge, that he would never consent to any arrangement by which, after Irish affairs had been handed over to an Irish Parliament, the representatives of Ireland should retain the right of interfering in the conduct of British affairs by the British Parliament. But though Mr.

Gladstone, even after the second reading, professed his determination to adhere to the policy of exclusion, he threw out a hint that, if pressure were brought to bear, he was prepared as usual to shift his ground. The Ministry, while adhering to the principle that, when Home Rule was granted, the Irish Members must only be allowed to take part in Imperial legislation, were. the Premier intimated, willing to accept any modifications of this principle which might commend itself to their supporters. Up to the last, this pretence was kept up. On the 10th of July, the Ministry opposed and defeated by a majority of 16 an amendment of Mr. Redmond to the Ninth Clause, to the effect that, during the six years' probationary period, the Irish representation at Westminster should remain unaltered. Given the circumstances, the amendment was the most logical solution of the difficulty, and was supported by Mr. Balfour and the bulk of the Opposition. Again, on the same day, when Mr. Heneage proposed the total exclusion of the Irish Members, the Premier moved the Closure. During the discussion of these two amendments, not the slightest indication was given that the Ministry had changed their minds. On the 12th, however-that is, on the eve of the day upon which the Ninth Clause had to be settled one way or the other by the system of automatic closure-Mr. Gladstone suddenly announced that, after having ascertained the views of their supporters, the Ministry had come to the conclusion to drop the in-and-out scheme altogether, and to retain the Irish representatives in Parliament for all purposes, whether British or Imperial, the only change being that this representation was to be diminished from 103 to 80. No explanation was vouchsafed then, or has been vouchsafed since, as to how the views of the Liberal party in Parliament had been ascertained, or by whom they had been expressed. If the alleged views had any existence elsewhere than in Mr. Gladstone's fertile imagination, they were doubtless expressed by Liberal agents of the Schnadhorst type, who pointed out the obvious truth that, however beneficial the exclusion of the Irish Members from legislating on British affairs might be to Great Britain, it was absolutely fatal to the interests of the Liberal party. Without the Nationalist vote, the Liberals must, for many years to come, be in a minority; and therefore to exclude or curtail this vote, was, from a party point of view, an act of suicide. As soon as Mr. Gladstone learnt that adherence to his plighted words might imperil his own retention of office, and involve the exclusion of his party from power, he resolved, as the less of two evils, to eat his own words and abandon his own principles. The diminution of the Irish vote was designed

to cover his retreat and to enable him to argue that he had, in some sort of fashion, redeemed his pledges. But care was taken to prevent this diminution from weakening materially the strength of the Nationalist vote. By an arbitrary scheme of disfranchisement, which the House of Commons was never allowed or intended to discuss, the constituencies to be disfranchised were so selected as to decrease the strength of the Loyalist vote, and to increase the strength of the Nationalist vote. Under the new representation, supposing it ever to come into force, the Protestants of Ireland will be even more inadequately represented than they are at present, while the Roman Catholics will have a relatively larger number of representatives. On the day following this startling disclosure, the 'omnes omnia' clause, as it was styled by Mr. Gladstone's admirers, was carried by a majority of 27, the diminution in the Ministerial numbers being mainly caused by the fact that five Gladstonians-Messrs. Bolton, Clark, Atherley-Jones,

Rathbone, and Wallace-declined to vote.

Either by accident or design, the disclosure of the financial proposals which are to regulate the future relations between the Irish and the Imperial Exchequers under Home Rule was kept back till after the House of Commons had passed the Ninth Clause and stood committed to the principle that, even after Ireland has been granted full legislative and executive autonomy, she is to retain the right of giving a casting vote, not only on all Imperial, but on all purely British affairs. There are, conceivably, limits even to the subserviency of the Gladstonian Liberals; and it may have been thought that their longsuffering patience would have been exhausted if it had been known that Great Britain was actually to pay for the privilege of repealing the Union, in as far as Ireland is concerned, and retaining it, in as far as England is concerned. The total revenue of Ireland is estimated by the Chancellor of the Exchequer as a little under seven millions. The expenditure on Irish charges is a little over four millions and a half. By the proposed arrangement Ireland is only to pay the difference. which amounts in round numbers to two millions three hundred thousand, to the British Treasury. Moreover, during the sexennial period of probation, certain deductions are to be allowed to the Irish Exchequer which it is calculated would reduce the Irish subvention by some eight hundred thousand a year. The only possible reason that can be assigned for this extraordinary liberality is that Mr. Gladstone has pledged himself to the Nationalists to provide the Home Rule Government with a surplus of half a million and that, as his original calculations

calculations had proved entirely erroneous, he could only redeem his promise by taking the surplus out of the pockets of the British taxpayer. It is worth noting here that the error in the original calculations on which the financial Clauses were first based must fairly be attributed to some odd mental confusion on the part of their author. As, owing to the Closure, the financial arrangements of the Bill were never really discussed in Parliament, it is impossible to say more about the principle on which the contribution of Ireland to the Imperial revenue was assessed, beyond that, on the face of it, the arrangement was unduly favourable to Ireland, and most unjustly onerous

to Great Britain.

In the same way, the House and the country were kept persistently in the dark as to the intentions of the Government with regard to the course of public business. When once the 'closure by compartments' had been proposed and adopted, it became obvious that the Home Rule Bill would be carried through the House of Commons in time to be sent up to the Lords early in September. But the middle of August had been well-nigh reached before the Government showed its hand. On the 12th of that month—the day on which, in happier times, a very large proportion of the Members used to be found on the moors of Scotland-Mr. Gladstone announced that the House would remain sitting until the Home Rule Bill had been sent to the Upper House, and till the Estimates had been voted, and that the Government were disposed to hold an autumn Session. A week later it was resolved, at Mr. Gladstone's instance, to closure the debate on the Bill, as reported, on the 25th of August. On the 1st of September the Home Rule Bill was read a third time and passed, and it was only on the 3rd of September that Parliament was informed that the Government had definitely made up their minds to hold an autumn Session in November, which was to be entirely devoted to Government business; that business consisting in the discussion of the Parish Councils and Employers' Liability Bills. As a matter of tactics, the reticence of the Ministry may be defended. But this sort of sharp practice is not in accordance with the traditions of our Parliamentary life. However, when all is said and done, the Opposition secured a substantial success by their prolonged resistance to the Home Rule Bill in Committee. It is evident that, if the Government had had their own way, the autumn Session would have been devoted to passing the One Man One Vote, and the Registration Reform Bills,-measures which, in the opinion of the Ministry, would, if carried by the House of Commons, and rejected, as they would have been most certainly

and most properly by the House of Lords, improve their chances at the next General Election. If the Government had persisted in their original design, the Opposition would have fought the Estimates, vote by vote, and would have thereby placed the Ministry on the horns of a dilemma of either prolonging the Session till a re-assembling of Parliament this year became a physical impossibility, or of resorting again to the Closure, in order to pass Supply. In view of this difficulty, the Ministry modified their programme, and the Opposition carried the day.

Throughout the course of the wearisome debates in the Lower House, the task of defending the Bill practically devolved on Mr. Gladstone alone. While it is impossible to avoid a certain feeling of admiration for the vigour and energy with which the octogenarian Premier fought an uphill and a losing fight, it is equally impossible to deny that this defence displayed to an exaggerated degree the lack of plain dealing, the disregard of accuracy, the love of special pleading, and the inability to speak the truth whenever that truth comes into conflict with his own policy, which have throughout been the characteristics of Mr. Gladstone's statesmanship. In support of this allegation, it is only necessary to refer to the course of the debates. Whenever Mr. Gladstone was confronted with some statement made by him in the days before he became a convert to Home Rule, his mode of defence was stereotyped. First, he professed inability to remember the statement he was alleged to have made; then, when the report of his words was produced, he disputed the accuracy of the report; and lastly, when its substantial accuracy was proved beyond the possibility of denial, he declared that the meaning assigned to his utterances must not be interpreted in accordance with the usual rules of language, but in harmony with some mental gloss he had placed upon them, and of which, up to this time, he had given no Thus, in his controversy with the Duke of Devonshire, he explained away his famous appeal to the constituencies in 1885 to return him a majority numerous enough to enable him to legislate for Ireland, independent of the Irish vote, by asserting that this appeal only applied to a combination of circumstances that had ceased to exist. So, in all the various contests between the Unionists and their Nationalist assailants, in which the authority of the Speaker or the Chairman of Committees was disputed, Mr. Gladstone, instead of using his position as Leader of the House, as Prime Minister, and what is more still, as spokesman of the assembly in virtue of his age and his distinguished record, to uphold the power of the Chair, devoted all his energies to finding Vol. 177.—No. 354. 2 P excuses excuses for the allies by whom the dignity of Parliament was being abused and degraded. Mr. Conybeare, Mr. Sexton, and Mr. Logan were virtually saved from the penalty which their conduct in Parliament had justly merited by the studied reluctance of the Premier to support the Chair, by his undisguised eagerness to catch at any excuse which might obviate

the necessity of taking decisive action.

Indeed, the melancholy deterioration exhibited by the House of Commons during the late Session must be mainly attributed to the persistency with which Mr. Gladstone subordinated his duty as leader of the House to his interests as Chief of the Liberal party. The fact of that deterioration is unfortunately not open to dispute. For the first time in our Parliamentary annals, personal altercations, disregard of the rules of the House, distinct defiances of the constituted authorities of Parliament, and open brawls became matters of constant occurrence. It is not too much to say that, on various occasions, the language and proceedings of Parliament more nearly resembled those of a pothouse than of a legislative assembly. The attacks on the Chair, the abuse levelled at the Clerk of the House, the Fisher-Logan scuffle, ending as it did in a sort of free fight, are incidents which no honest Englishman, whatever his party politics may be, can recall without shame and grief. Of course, as happens in every such dispute, all parties concerned were more or less in the wrong. common fairness bids us admit that, in the great majority of instances, the chief culprits were the Nationalist members. The newspaper reports give but a faint impression of the studied insolence, the vulgar invective, the ill-bred interruptions, to which the Opposition, and especially the Liberal Unionists, were subjected throughout the Session by the Irish Members. The cries of 'Judas' with which Mr. Chamberlain was assailed on the night of the Closure being passed, were only a repetition of similar and scarcely less offensive outrages with which speaker after speaker on the Unionist side had been interrupted by the Nationalists. If these violations of Parliamentary usage and common decorum had been denounced at the outset by the English Liberals and their Leader, there would have been no repetition of the offence. Unfortunately, both an English Premier and an English party remained silent while these insults were levelled against their English fellowmembers; and the Nationalists, emboldened by the tacit encouragement of their English allies, went on till the scandal culminated in a free fight on the floor of the House. It is impossible to say who, in the actual scrimmage which took place place in the dog-days, was the immediate offender, but there is no difficulty in saying that the parties really responsible for this disgraceful scene were the Nationalists who for a long course of months had insulted the Unionists beyond endurance, and still more the English Liberals who had allowed these

insults to continue unchecked and unreproved.

It was therefore under most exceptional conditions that the Bill for the Better Government of Ireland was sent up to the House of Lords. It may be well to recall what those conditions were. The Bill was one repealing, in fact if not in name, the Act of Union, establishing a completely new Constitution for Ireland, and modifying most materially the Constitution of Great This Bill had only been passed by the employment of the Closure, in a manner never contemplated by the authors of the Closure system, and utterly opposed to all our parliamentary traditions. A majority of the Clauses, and these Clauses of the utmost importance, had been voted in dumb show, without a word of explanation or criticism. The measure was one on which the country never had expressed, and never could have expressed, an opinion of its own. Up to the meeting of Parliament, the scope and purport of the Bill had been concealed even from the supporters of the Government. During the progress of the debates, the measure had been repeatedly altered in some of its most fundamental provisions. It had been carried by the party vote of the narrow Ministerial majority. It had failed to attract any adhesions from the It had, if anything, lost ground amidst its Opposition. original supporters. There had been several secessions from the Ministerial ranks; and it was matter of notoriety that the Bill was viewed with extreme disapproval by a large section of the English Gladstonian Liberals, and that they would never have consented to vote in its favour, unless they had known beforehand that it was certain to be thrown out in the Upper House. Given these conditions-and their correctness cannot be disputed -it is obvious that the Peers would have failed in their duty if they had allowed the Bill to pass. Even if they had regarded the Bill as a useful measure, they would have been unworthy of their position if they had consented to allow a Bill brought to them in such circumstances to become the law of the land without the country being first consulted. Regarding it as they did-with or without reason-as one fraught with the gravest injury and peril to the commonweal, they would have been guilty of the grossest cowardice if they had shrunk from its rejection.

The Bill was sent up to the Lords on the 1st of September;

572

was read pro forma, for the first time, the same night, or, more accurately speaking, in the early hours of the following morning: the debate on the second reading commenced on the following Tuesday, and was concluded after four nights' discussion, when it was rejected by the overwhelming and unexpectedly large majority of 419 to 41. The debate was not unworthy either of the assembly or the occasion. The speeches of the Duke of Devonshire, the Duke of Argyll, Lord Selborne, and the Marquis of Salisbury, on the side of the Opposition, were remarkable specimens of Parliamentary oratory; while Lord Spencer, Lord Rosebery, and the Lord Chancellor made as good defences of the Bill as their briefs permitted, though it is a noticeable and remarkable fact that that defence was rather an advocacy of Home Rule generally, as an inevitable experiment, than a specific defence of the Bill before the House. Altogether, the discussion in the Lords was characterised by a broader and more statesmanlike view of the Bill than was possible in the popular branch of the Legislature; and showed, not for the first time, that in debating power our hereditary legislators are at least the equals of our elected representatives. The two criticisms of the Lords' debate which the organs of the Radical party have ventured to formulate, are palpably absurd. The allegation that the Lords took only four days to reject a Bill that the House of Commons had taken some fourscore days to pass, is met by the simple answer that nothing could be gained by discussing the details of a Bill to whose fundamental principles the Peers were absolutely opposed. It would be as reasonable to insist that a man who takes a bite of a joint of meat and finds it decayed, should eat the whole joint before he sends it away from his table. Four days were amply sufficient to enable the case for the Unionists and the Separatists to be stated fully and fairly; and when this was done, there was no ground or reason for prolonging an academic discussion. The second criticism is even more futile. We are told that the House of Lords were unwise in polling so large a vote, and ought to have been content with throwing out the Bill by a moderate majority. Naturally, the Gladstonians would have liked to say that a very large proportion of the Peers declined to vote at all, and that, therefore, they could not be said to view the possibility of the Bill becoming law as a serious danger to the country. But on this very account the Peers, feeling as they did, were bound to make their protest as impressive as possible. On such a question as this, the judgment of the House of Lords is one of which the country at large, whether agreeing with it or not, is certain to take account. It is impossible to show that the Peers have any special personal interest in the question, whether Home Rule is or is not to be conceded to Ireland. Taken as a body, they are men of high education, and of more than average intelligence; conversant, by experience, with State affairs; imbued with all the traditions of English statesmanship, and holding a very large stake in the country. The fact that such a body should assemble in unprecedented numbers simply to swell the majority by which the Home Rule Bill was certain to be defeated, cannot but weigh with the British public. Nor will the public overlook the discrepancy, not only between the numbers, but between the standing, of the Peers whose votes were given against and for the second reading. Amongst the former will be found the name of well-nigh every Peer who has played a prominent part in public life, or who has made any mark in the world by other means than the mere accident of birth. Amongst the latter, with the exception of the Members of the Ministry who have seats in the Upper House, there were not half-a-dozen Peers of the slightest eminence, the only ones whom we can recall being Lord Coleridge, Lord Aberdeen, Lord Thring, and Lord Farrer, who are all personal friends and nominees of the Prime Minister. The impressiveness of this vote is increased by the circumstance that it cannot be described as a purely party demonstration. If the majority had consisted only of the Conservative Peers, it might have been said that they voted against the Bill simply and solely to secure the interests of their party; but as it was, the majority was very largely swollen by Peers who, till the conversion of Mr. Gladstone to Home Rule, voted as a rule with the Liberal minority, and who in many cases owed their Peerages to the services they had rendered in bygone days to the Liberal party.

Thus it will be seen that the conditions were not favourable to the raising of any outery against the Lords on the plea that, as hereditary legislators, they had dared to withstand the will of the people. Nobody out of Bedlam ever supposed that, under our Constitution, the House of Lords could ever resist permanently the decision of the nation. We have no hesitation in repeating the assertion which was so absurdly misrepresented when it appeared in our article of the last number, that if the constituencies should, at the next General Election, return a majority favourable to Mr. Gladstone's Home Rule policy, the attitude of the House of Lords must of necessity be materially altered. They may still retain their present opinion as to the inexpediency and undesirability of passing such a measure in principle, but in practice they must accept the decision

of the Court to which they have appealed. It is therefore simply childish to talk of the Lords endeavouring to override the verdict of the nation. All the Upper House demands is that, before the country is committed to Home Rule in the form ultimately adopted by the Ministerialists on Mr. Gladstone's initiative, the constituencies should be consulted as to whether they approve or disapprove of the measure in question. Mr. Gladstone has propounded, as usual, a theory of his own to justify an untenable position. The country, he admits, as he could not help admitting, was completely ignorant of the character of his Bill, not only before the General Election, but before the opening of the Session. But the country, he alleges, had signified its approval of the general principle of Home Rule, and had given him a blank power of attorney to frame any measure which, in his opinion, best carried out the above principle. The Lords, by rejecting his Bill, have defied the authority of the people, and are therefore deserving of popular censure. Quod erat demonstrandum.

The plea is certain to be made use of by his adherents. But it is too complicated and too involved to have much influence with the public. Even if the argument were as sound as it is unsound, all it would prove is that the Lords have displayed unnecessary caution by insisting on the constituencies being allowed to judge of the measure as it stands, instead of being compelled to accept it on the mere strength of Mr. Gladstone's recommendation. Yet, in the name of common-sense, what is the use of a Second Chamber at all, unless it is to furnish a safeguard against sudden and ill-considered legislation? It is impossible to conceive of a Second Chamber possessing any independent authority which would not have contended that the Act of Union could not be repealed without the solemn and deliberate sanction of the electorate. This assertion can only be disputed on the ground that our Second Chamber ought to be a mere Court of Record. Yet, on this hypothesis, a Second Chamber has no reason of existence. To say that the House of Lords is an obstruction to progress, because it retards violent and sudden legislation, is as unreasonable as to complain of a brake because it diminishes the rapidity with which a carriage descends a hill. In the same way the forms of the House of Commons have hitherto tended to retard and delay over-rapid legislation. By the application of the Closure, in accordance with Mr. Gladstone's innovation. this check has been removed; and unless the country is to be governed henceforward by the uncontrolled caprice of the majority for the time being in the House of Commons, or, in other other words, by the good will and pleasure of the leader of the dominant party, a Second Chamber has become a greater necessity than ever. Given the necessity for such a Chamber, we fail to see how any assembly that human ingenuity could devise would meet the requirements of this country better than the House of Lords. An hereditary Legislature may be a theoretical anomaly; but Englishmen are very tolerant of anomalies, so long as they serve a useful purpose. An outcry for the abolition of the Upper House is not calculated in the present circumstances to attract any support from the general public.

That this is so, and is felt to be so, is proved by the attitude of the Gladstonian party since the rejection of the Home Rule Bill. A feeble attempt has been made to show that the Peers are interfering with the rights of the elected branch of the Legislature by forcing on a dissolution. The simple answer is that the Peers have not the power, even if they have the wish, to dictate to the Ministry whether they shall or shall not appeal to the country. Unless the Sovereign exercises the Royal prerogative-a contingency which never has occurred of late yearsthe question whether Parliament ought or ought not to be dissolved depends upon her Majesty's Ministers. It is for them, and for them alone, to decide whether the rejection of any measure they may have proposed, by either House, is or is not a sufficient reason for their resigning office, or requesting permission to dissolve Parliament. In the present instance, Mr. Gladstone has, apparently, come to the conclusion that the rejection of the Bill which was to restore peace and good will between Great Britain and Ireland, which was to have been the crowning achievement of his public life, and upon which the whole energies of the House of Commons have been expended throughout a session of unwonted length and labour, is or is not a matter of sufficient importance to justify either resignation or dissolution. As Mr. Toots used to observe, in 'Dombey and Son,' 'it is really of no consequence.' Mr. Gladstone's opinion on this point seems to be fully shared by his colleagues, and to be heartily approved by his followers. We may be surprised at this decision; we may find difficulty in reconciling it with the assumption that the passing of the Bill was a matter of such urgent and pressing importance in the interest of the country as to brook no delay. But we cannot deny that the Ministry are within their constitutional right in declining alike to resign or dissolve. This admission, however, carries with it the corollary that the Lords cannot be fairly charged with any attempt to force on a dissolution. All they have done is to refuse to pass the Bill till after it has been submitted to the constituencies; and

if the Ministry consider that the matter can stand over without injury to a more convenient season, they remain absolutely and entirely at liberty to act upon their conviction. All our Parliamentary traditions and precedents are, it is true, opposed to the indefinite postponement of a measure involving fundamental changes in our Constitution. But if the Ministry chose to disregard tradition and precedent, the Lords are powerless to interfere with their decision. According to the contention of Mr. Gladstone and his following, the Lords are acting in defiance of the will of the people. The Lords reply by saying, Prove to us that this is the will of the people by appealing to the country; and we shall, whether we approve or not, give effect to their verdict. To this declaration no answer is forthcoming. As a matter of fact, therefore, any delay in the realization of the 'union of hearts' which the Home Rule Bill was designed according to its authors to accomplish, is due not to its rejection by the Lords, but to the reluctance of the Ministry to appeal to the constituencies. Had the Government really been sincere in their assertion that the country was in their favour, they would have announced their intention to request the Queen to dissolve Parliament immediately upon the rejection of the Bill by the Lords. They would have proceeded forthwith to wind up the necessary business of the Session, in which task they would have received the cordial co-operation of the Unionists; and about the time these lines appear in print, they would on their own showing have received that triumphant endorsement of their policy, which, as they allege, the country is ready and eager to bestow. They have done nothing of the They cling to office and they refuse to dissolve.

The real truth is, that long before the actual division in the Lords, the Liberal leaders had come to the conclusion that it would be useless to raise the cry of the Lords against the people. All the reports received from agents, canvassers, and local caucuses agreed in stating that the great body of the Liberal electorate were absolutely indifferent about Home Rule, and had no distinct opinion upon the subject, other than that the Irish were, and are, and always will be a nuisance, and that if they could be got rid of so much the better. Moreover, these reports held out little hope, in existing circumstances, of exciting any popular resentment against the House of Lords as an institution. These anticipations were fully confirmed by the event. Many weeks have passed since, according to the orthodox Gladstonian theory, the country was flouted by the Hereditary Chamber. Yet the country remains absolutely silent, unconcerned, and indifferent to the alleged defiance of its will. Mr. Schnadhorst,

bae

and the busybodies of the National Liberal Association, have issued one or two feeble manifestoes denouncing the action of the Lords, and threatening them vaguely with the wrath to come, supposing they do not amend their ways and bow to the will of an outraged nation. But the manifestoes have fallen flat, and the public goes on its way without taking the slightest note of these abortive appeals to popular passions and class jealousies. The Liberals are fully aware that a campaign against the Lords on account of their rejection of Home Rule would meet with no success, and attribute the certain failure of such a campaign, if undertaken, to the fact that the particular measure rejected by the Lords is one to which the public at large are indifferent, if not positively hostile. We believe ourselves that the explanation of the apathy lies deeper. The relative positions of the two Houses have changed materially within the last thirty or forty years. It is not so much that the House of Lords has gained ground in popular esteem, as that the House of Commons has lost ground. Somehow or other the working classes have abandoned their old belief in political reforms, as calculated to effect any great improvement in their own condition. Instinct tells them that social changes of the kind they have at heart are likely to encounter much more serious opposition in the Commons, where the capitalist and industrial elements are so largely represented, than in an assembly mainly composed of great landowners. Millowners, masters of works, directors of industrial companies, and employers of labour do not, as a body, appeal to the sympathies or the imagination of the workmen with whose interests and aims they necessarily are brought into conflict; whereas a Peer, somehow or other, is always a persona grata to English working men as to every other class of Englishmen. We do not say that this instinctive distrust of the House of Commons on the part of our working classes, and this sort of goodhumoured liking for the House of Lords, would stand the test of any conflict concerning which popular feeling was deeply agitated. But we do say it tends to make any outcry against the Lords ineffective so long as their only offence is that they are not in accord with the House of Commons.

Thus, the Ministry are at their wits' end how at once to justify their inaction, and yet to stimulate the enthusiasm of their supporters. The Schnadhorst pronunciamento has proved a mere brutum fulmen, and has aroused derision rather than enthusiasm. The Council of the Home Counties Division of the National Liberal Association, after expressing their regret at their inability to find a Lord to preside at their meeting, passed a resolution

a resolution declaring that 'the House of Lords is a grievous hindrance to legislation, and ought to be abolished.' Even this stage thunder failed to excite the public. Weeks have passed since the Lords defied the will of the people and defeated the Ministry, and yet, while the people remained utterly unconcerned, not a single Minister, with one signal exception, has come forward to protest against the manner in which their labours had been rendered useless. It was finally left to Mr. Gladstone to bell the cat. The lack of public interest in the controversy between the Ministry and the Lords is exemplified by the fact that a flying visit to Edinburgh was selected as the occasion of explaining the policy of the Government before a limited and packed audience. The Home Rule Bill was rejected on the 8th of September. It was only on the 27th that Mr. Gladstone communicated to the country, at the Albert Hall in Edinburgh, the view that he and his colleagues took of the As usual, the Premier's speech was long and verbose; as usual, its meaning was confused and its statements were capable of a variety of interpretations. What Mr. Gladstone really meant we do not pretend to say, but he did not advise, and we have no hesitation in saying that he does not contemplate, any direct attack on the House of Lords. He used a great deal of 'tall talk.' The Lords were warned in solemn tones, that 'they had raised a greater question than they were probably aware of.' A doubt was expressed whether they realized the truth that by their action they had attracted attention to the anomaly of their own independent and irresponsible existence;' and a confident assertion was made that, in the end, they would 'lament bitterly having ever raised this issue.' The words are brave words, and point logically to one conclusion; namely, that Mr. Gladstone proposes to lead a campaign for the abolition of the Hereditary Chamber. But here, somehow, his courage oozed away, and all the practical suggestion he could offer was the utterance of a hope 'that wiser counsels may prevail in the House of Lords.' It is impossible to conceive of a bolder indictment followed by a tamer ending. It recalls, perforce, the old story of the tailor who had been wronged by a customer, alike in his relations as a husband, a trader, and a man, and who after reciting his wrongs and telling how his home had been made desolate, how his money had been purloined, how he had been insulted before his own shopmen, and finally kicked down his own stairs, wound up by bidding his assailant beware, 'because a little more would rouse the British lion.' In like fashion, the Lords are bidden to be careful how they trespass much further on the magnanimity

nimity of Mr. Gladstone and the forbearance of the Liberal party. But, as yet, their cup is not full, and meanwhile Mr. Gladstone contents himself with reminding them, like the hero of a transpontine melodrama, that 'a time will come.'

The main object of the Prime Minister's harangue was to cover his retreat and to stir up a vague animosity towards the House of Lords among the public, while refusing to commit himself to any definite action against the Hereditary Chamber of the Legislature. The second object was to hold out general hopes to the various sections of his adherents, that if he were only allowed to continue in office, he would be in a position to carry out the measures to which they are respectively devoted. Thus the Scotch Liberals were promised a Parish Councils Bill and the disestablishment of the State Church at some date not precisely specified, but represented generally as not remote. Promises equally vast and equally vague were made to Wales. London was assured it would not have long to wait for Municipal Reform, provided Mr. Gladstone kept in power. The Temperance Party were comforted by the avowal that their cause was too important for its consideration to be long delayed; and the partisans of the Eight Hours' Bill were cheered by the announcement that the question is one 'that manifestly cannot be put aside.' The Nationalists were, meanwhile, kept quiet by a characteristic assertion of the Premier that 'Home Rule will appear again above the waves in which it has for the moment appeared to flounder,' and that its reappearance will take place during the coming Session.

Judging by these indications, it is not difficult to forecast the policy the Liberal party intend to pursue under Mr. Gladstone's leadership. The rejection by the House of Lords of the Home Rule Bill will be treated as a mere incident which, however regrettable in itself, and however calculated to bring trouble upon the authors, does not necessitate either resignation or dissolution. Duty, according to Mr. Gladstone's contention, compels the Liberal party, having received a mandate from the constituencies to carry out a number of measures, of which the concession of autonomy to Ireland was only one, not to abandon their position because this particular item of their programme has been rendered incapable of immediate realization by the ill-advised obstinacy of the Peers. They have got to pass the Parish Councils Bill, to disestablish State Churches in Scotland and Wales, to make Local Option the law of the land, and to restrict the hours of labour by legislation, before they are justified in abandoning the advantage secured to them by the possession of a majority in the House of Commons, however narrow

and however precarious. The One Man One Vote and the Registration Reform Bills have apparently been dropped out of the programme, because these measures excite no great amount of immediate interest. Even upon the most sanguine calculations, several sessions must elapse before Bills establishing Parish Councils, disestablishing the Church of England in Wales and the Church of Scotland north of the Tweed, sanctioning Local Option, and restricting the hours of labour, can be passed through the House of Commons, even by the aid of a subservient party and the wholesale application of the Closure. During this period the Ministry will be enabled to remain in office. This in itself is an immediate advantage. But, apart from the above consideration, to which Mr. Gladstone, owing to his age and disposition, is keenly alive, the programme in question has great tactical recommendations, from a Liberal partisan's point of view. If the Government can succeed in passing through the House of Commons all or any considerable portion of the measures foreshadowed in Mr. Gladstone's manifesto, these measures will be sent up in due course to the House of Lords, and either accepted or rejected. In the former case, the Liberals will gain the credit of having carried a series of measures which, rightly or wrongly, commend themselves to large sections of the electorate. In the latter case, the Lords will acquire the discredit of having resisted legislation which commands a considerable amount of popular support. The Lords will (to put it plainly) be placed in the dilemma of either having to pass Bills whose enactment would strengthen the hold of the Liberal party on the constituencies at the next election, or of throwing out these Bills and thereby causing their rejection of the Home Rule Bill to be attributed, not to any conscientious disapproval of the particular measure, but to a general dislike of all popular reforms. The tactics adopted by Mr. Gladstone may be, and are, disingenuous, but they are certainly not wanting in ingenuity.

How far these tactics are likely to be successful depends, in the first instance, upon the attitude of the Irish Nationalists. It is childish to imagine that such a series of measures, encountering as they must, one and all, an opposition not only formidable in itself, but one not restricted by purely party lines, can be carried within any reasonable period if the time of Parliament is to be once more taken up by the Home Rule controversy. It is by no means certain that the Irish Members are either willing or able to consent to the indefinite postponement of Home Rule. Still, our impression is that, knowing as they do their one chance of attaining Home Rule at all, to consist in

keeping

keeping Mr. Gladstone in power, they will, in the end, consent upon conditions, to Home Rule being laid on the shelf till the Ministry can pass the measures that, as they hope, will enable them to obtain a renewal of their mandate from the constituencies.

It is too early as yet to express any positive opinion as to what, in these circumstances, ought to be the policy of the Unionists. The defence must wait till the attack is more pronounced than it is at present. It remains to be seen how far the Government is or is not discredited in the country by the defeat of their chief measure and by their absolute refusal to consult the constituencies as to whether the measure in question meets with popular approval. It remains to be seen whether the Nationalists will or will not render the Ministry the support required to keep them in office, if Home Rule is put aside for the present; and, above all, it remains to be seen how far the public respond to the appeals which will be made to induce them to believe that, in some ill-defined way, they have been flouted and injured by the action of the Lords.

So far there is, we repeat, no symptom of anything approaching popular agitation on the subject. On the contrary, what indications there have been of public opinion would seem to show that the current of sentiment runs towards the Unionists rather than towards the Separatists; but in all calculations based on the ebb and flow of popular sentiment, no certainty is possible. All the Unionists can do for the time being, is to impress upon the public the urgent necessity for a General Election, in order to settle the Home Rule question one way or the other; to hinder this, the main and vital issue, from being obscured by collateral considerations; to uphold the cause for which they have fought so long and so gallantly; to maintain the closest union between Conservatives and Liberal Unionists; and to await the result without undue confidence, but with a well-founded belief in the ultimate triumph of common-sense

and common honesty.

INDEX

TO THE

HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-SEVENTH VOLUME OF THE QUARTERLY REVIEW.

A

Aberdeen, Lord, coalition with the Whigs, 537.

Achillini, exponent of the Averroism philosophy, 501 — experienced debater, 503—personal appearance, ib. Adams, Rev. H. C., 'Wykehamica,' 372.

Alexander, Emperor of Russia, succeeds to the throne, 419—his character, ib.—policy towards France, 420—changes his opinion of Napoleon, 421—withdraws Oubril and his staff, 422—scheme for a general coalition, ib.—accepts the Prussian alliance, 424—threatened with invasion, 426—interviews with Napoleon, 428, 436—instructions to Tolstoi, 432—discussions with Caulaincourt, 433—advice from Talleyrand, 437—his relations with Austria, 440.

Allectus defeated, 337. America, The Discovery of, 1—the old-world mariners, 8, 9—theories and conjectures of Aristotle and others, 9-12, 15—due to trade-winds and currents, 13—Columbus's plan, 15— Portuguese explorations, 16 - Genoese discoveries, 17-number of expeditions, 22—errors in uniting Asia and America, 23—various explorers, 25, 27—narrow compass of exploration, 26-unlicensed expeditions, ib. -foundation of the name, 31—the Gulf of Mexico, 32-Revolution of 1775, 37—development under the English, 38—independence and progress of the New World, 39-the system of self-government, 304—the Constitution, 305—restrictions, 305, 307—originality, 306—system of 'rotation,' 308—type of the 'industrial' system, &.—important results, 309-'distrust of the individual,' 310 -the spread of corruption, 311nature of the plebiscite, ib .- meaning of 'Democracy,' 312-evils of corruption, ib. - growing combinations, 314-views of the States out West, ib. - the work of 'private enterprise,' 316-public school training, 317 — Universities, 4b. — individual benevolence, 318—freedom a negative condition, ib .- advance in Vol. 177.-No. 354.

art and civilization, 319—extinction of slavery, ib.—establishment of a polity, 320—superiority in morals, ib.—influence of Christianity, 321—literature and Society, 322—memories of the Declaration of Independence, ib.—the evils of democratic freedom, 323–325—development of moral suasion, 325—loyalty to the State, 326—social progress and independence, ib.—elements of the Constitution, 327.

Ancient Régime, The Fall of the, 212
—meaning of the term, 214.
Andrieux, Mons. L., Prefect of Police,

Andrieux, Mons. L., Prefect of Police, 238—his account of the secret agents, th.—difficulties in the employment of political spies, 239.

Archer, T. A., attempted vindication of Mr. Freeman, 77—hopeless nature of his task, 80—weakness of his cause, 81—his perversion of statements, 84—ignores the real charge, 85—on the matter of the palisade, 16.—reliance on Wace's authority, 86—misstatements on the existence of a 'fosse,' 86, 87—suppresses allusions to the shield-wall, 88—arguments against its existence, 90, 91—on the evidence of the Bayeux Tapestry, 93—adapts his facts to his requirements, 16.—new evidence of the 'lices,' 94-96—misstatements on the position of the troops, 99.

Armstrong, Captain, as a spy, 245—subsequent career, 246.

Arnold, Dr., the reviver of the Public Schools system, 372.

Asclepiodotus, Prefect, defeats Allectus, 337, 338.

Asquith, Rt. Hon. H. H., M.P., on the value of political espionage, 236. Austria invaded by Napoleon, 423, 441.

Averroës, his Great Commentary, 500—spread of his doctrines, ib.

R

Bacon on the advantage of sea-power, 331.

Bastidas, R. de, his exploration westward, 28. Baudri, Abbot of Bourgeuil, Poem of

Z Q

the Battle of Hastings, 73—ignores the existence of a 'palisade,' 75 tactics of the Norman infantry, ib .onslaught by the English, 76.

Bayeux Tapestry, its importance, 74. Bill, The Dishonoured, 552—policy of the Government, 554 - inadequate time for discussion, 555-result of discussion under the Closure, 556, 564-defeat of Conservative amendments, 557-562 - disfranchisement of Dublin University, 558 - protection of civil servants, ib. - exclusion of illiterate voters, 559 — treatment of landlords, ib.--Bills of Exchange, 560-system of Protection, 561-Bills of Attainder, ib .-Imperial supremacy, 562 — importance of freedom in debate, 564— 'in and out' scheme abandoned, 566 -the financial proposals, 567-reticence of the Government, 568 deterioration of the House, 570exceptional conditions of the Bill, 571-sent to the Lords, ib.-rejection of the second reading, 572-criticisms on the Lords' debate, ib .- impressiveness of the judgment, 573—attitude of the Gladstonian party, 575—indifference of the Liberal electorate, 576-measures to be passed, 579.

Bookbinding, 178-absence of systematic historical sequence, 179-the first known specimens, 180 - the Egyptian roll, ib .- the folded form, 181-the origin of artistic binding, 181—the origin of artistic binding, ib.—costly style of the 'Byzantine coatings,' 182—precautions against the book-thief, ib.— privileges of monks, 183—princely patrons, 184, 201—various processes before production, 184, 185—changes in the character, 186—tooling in gold, 187
Theorem Mixid's tests in decare -Thomaso Maioli's taste in decoration, ib.-Grolier's geometrical designs, 189-method of 'blocking, 191-decline of the Italian art and rise of the French, ib .- meaning of devices, 192-progress in Germany, 193 - prominent craftsmen, ib. -English work, 194-various fashions, 194-196—the fanfare and dentelle patterns, 197—names of famous binders, 197-199, 209-211—prices paid for good examples, 199-style of Nicolas Ferrar, 200—symptoms of decline in France, ib.-adoption of the 'doublure,' 201—the Padeloup family, 202—the Derômes, 4b.— introduction of the flat back, 203 destruction during the Revolution, ib .- successful binders, 204, 205rapid advance in England, 205-the 'Harleian' bindings, ib. - covers emblematical of the contents, 206, 207-the work of refugees, 208-

Roger Payne's work, 209. Bryce, The Rt. Hon. J., M.P., American Commonwealth,' 297. Burdett, H. C., 'Hospitals and Asylums

of the World, 465—encyclopædic character of his book, 466. Burke, Sir Bernard, 'The Peerage,'

396-repetition of fables, 397-need for revision and correction, ib.— absurd pedigrees, 397-400—'Dela-warr,' 400—the Howards, 401 pedigree of the Duke of Fife, 402creation of the Tweedmouth peerage, 404-on Scottish genealogy, ib.-the Barony of Ruthven, 407, 408—the Barony of Kingsale, 411—carelessness as to dates of creation, 414.

Burton, Dr., Head Master of Winchester, 377-establishes a boardinghouse for commoners, ib.

Butt, Isaac, his political career, 280scheme of Home Rule, 281.

C.

Cabot, John, voyages under the English flag, 22—reaches Florida, ib. Cabral, P. A., expedition to the East Indies, 28-lands in Porto Seguro,

Camden Society, association of historical enthusiasts, 135.

Carausius wrests Britain from the Romans, 337—murdered, ib. Chamberlain, The Rt. Hon. Joseph,

M.P., his successful exposition of the Home Rule Bill, 286.

'La chute de Chereste, M. Aimé,

l'Ancien Régime, 212. Chicago, 297 — the 7th largest city 299—representative of the Industrial Era, ib.—cosmopolitan city, 300 population, 310-increased value of property, ib.—situation, 302—compared with Hellenic cities, 303.

Churchill, Lord R., his political resur-

rection, 287.

palitions, 525 — in Queen Anne's reign, ib.—against Sir Robert Wal-Coalitions, 525 pole, 526-529-of 1783 against Lord Shelburne, 529-533-hostility of the constituencies, 531-of 1852 against Mr. Disraeli, 533-539—motives and objects of the Whig party, 536, 537 the danger of sudden and superficial

coalitions, 538—policy of the Peelites, ib.—'All the Talents,' 539—object of the Coalition, ib.—the Moderates of 1827, 540—of 1795, ib.—approximation of the Whigs to the Government, 541-result of the alliance, 542-of 1835-41, ib.-the notes of a legitimate Coalition, 544-period of Mr. Gladstone's second Administration, 545-evidence of approximation of opinion, 546-change in the party system, 547-the future Constitutional party, 548 — unnatural alliance between Mr. Sexton and Mr. Gladstone, 549-danger of the present crisis, 549-551.

Cobden - Sanderson, T. J., champion of the emblematic school of binding,

Colomb, Admiral, his comment on Nottingham's despatch, 348.

Columbus, Christopher, his ambition, 6-description of himself, 7-his clear and complete plan, 15-attempts to obtain the needful resources, 18-20 - commissioned by Queen Isabella, 1492, 20- first vovage, ib .- third voyage in 1498, 21misconception, ib.—failure and imprisonment, 24—last voyage, death, ib .- introduces the slave trade, 25compared with other explorers, ib .his embargo upon adventurers, 26.

Contarini, Gaspar, his reply to Pom-ponatius' book, 510.

Cornutus, the Stoic philosopher, 159-his reply to Nero, 160. Courthope, Mr., 'Historic Peerage,' 386. Cramond, Mr., on the pedigree of the Duke of Fife, 402.

Cundall, Mr. J., 'On Bookbindings,' 178.

Dasent, J. R., 'Acts of the Privy Council of England,' 131—extract

from the preface, 134. Dicey, Prof. A. V., 'A Leap in the Dark,' 265-his concise and clear work, ib .- on the best result of Home Rule, 266—the character of the Irish people, ib.—proposes the Referendum system, 268—on the Act of the Union, 270-on the finding of the Parnell Commission, 272.

Duseuil, Abbé, his inlaid binding, 201.

Elton, Chas. I., 'The Career of Columbus,' 1-his style, 5. England, history of artistic bookbinding in, 194-sea-power a condition of existence, 330 - difference between command and sovereignty of the sea, 331-necessity for maintaining the Navy, 332 - importance of retaining command of the sea, 354-unlimited power, 356—condition of the Navy, 357—position with France and Russia, 417—seizes the Danish fleet,

Europe, the four great Powers, 417—condition of the Continent, 418 the Third Coalition, 422.

Farrer, J. A., quotation from his work 'Paganism and Christianity,'

Fiorentino, Prof., on Pomponatius, 498 -review of Prof. Ferris' work, 499,

Fitzpatrick, W. J., on the political spies in Ireland, 241—description of Samuel Turner, 242—McNally, 244 -Captain Armstrong, 245.

Fitzroy, Admiral, commands the Blue fleet, 333—his telegram to the Admiralty, ib.

Foster, Joseph, his 'Peerage,' 389-on Lord Tweedmouth's pedigree, 403his determined honesty, 404.

France, eminence in the art of bookbinding, 191-richness of ornamentation, 193-symptoms of decline, 200 -subdivision of the land, 213peasant proprietors, 214—suppression of the Parlements, 215—restoration, 219-condition of society, 216 —desire for scientific knowledge, ib.
—society of 'Economists,' 217 accession of Louis XVI., &.-Turgot's policy, 218-the fall of Necker, 220-military regulation of 1781, ib. —the feudal reaction, 221—apparent prosperity under Calonne, 222— failure of the Assembly of Notables, ib .- resistance of the Parlement, 223 — opposition to the Provincial Assemblies, 224, 225—conflicts be-tween the Province of Béarn and the Government, 225-227-Brittany, 227-230-Dauphiny, 230-Franche Comté, 231—Languedoc, 232—Provence, ib. — department of secret political agents, 238.

Freeman, E. A., on the Bayeux Tapestry, 74—theory of the advance of the Normans, 76—peculiar use of authorities, 78-vigorous adaptations, 79-view of the 'fosse' disaster, ib .-

theory of the 'palisade,' \$2-fails to produce proofs, 83—use of the term shield-wall, 89—equipment of soldiers, 91—paraphrases Wace, 97—summary of the battle, 98—disposition of the English forces, 101, 102 -unauthentic history, 103.

G. E. C., 'Complete Peerage,' 386character of his work, 387-the writs of summons, ib.—outspoken honesty, 388—on doubtful titles, 389—the origin of Peers, 391—on pretentious affectations in names and styles, ib. -the title of Warwick, 392-the purchase system, ib.—the practice of abeyance, 393—the Earldom of Mar, 406—on the imperfect knowledge of the Irish peerage, 410—the ranking of peers, 411-the Barony of Kingsale, 411-414.

Genoese discoveries, 16, 17.

Germany, progress of bookbinding in,

Gipps, Sir G., Governor of New South Wales, 50.

Gladstone, The Rt. Hon. W. E., M.P., despatch on transportation, 54-aversion to compromise, 284-mode of conducting defence of his Home Rule Bill, 290—accepts the terms of the Nationalists, 292—his principle and practice, tb.—scheme to eject Mr. Disraeli, 534—influence over the Peelites, 538—unnatural alliance Peelites, 538—unnatural aluance with Mr. Sexton, 549—opinion of 'A Leap in the Dark, 552—credulity of his followers, 554—decision to apply the Closure, 555, 564—demands of the Radicals, 563-'in and out' project, 565—abandons the scheme, 566—defence of the Bill, 569—characteristics of his statesmanship, ib .theory justifying his position, 574—declines to resign or dissolve, 575 speech at Edinburgh, 578—promises to his adherents, 579-ingenuity of his tactics, 580.

Gobineau, M. de, 'Sur l'Inégalité des Races humaines,' 297-his feudal

prejudices, 300.

Gordon, The Hon. Sir A. See Stanmore. Grolier, Jean, founder of the French school of binding, 188, 189.

Harrisse, Henry, 'The Discovery of America,' 1-characteristics of his book, 2-his theory of history, ib .- on the question of Columbus reaching

Cathay, 21.

Hastings, The Battle of, 73—statements against the 'palisade,' 82, 83—result of enquiry, 83.

Hillebrandt, Prof., 'Vedische Mytho-

logie,' 452-on the identification of Soma, ib.

Hojeda, A. de, his expedition, 27. See America.

Home Rule, disadvantages, 267—result of a Referendum vote, 269, 270origin of the movement, 274-his-

tory of various agitations, 274-281. Hospital, The Modern, 464-increase in the number, size, and organization, 465-ancient institutions, 467 -foundation of Christian institu-tions, ib.-rights of the voluntary contributor, 468 — appointment of Governors, ib.—injudicious distribution of letters, 469-admission of the sick, ib.—administration and number of governors, 470—the house com-mittee, ib.—influence of medical men on the expenditure, 471-cost of in-patients' food, 472-extravagance in drugs and surgical appliances, ib. -suitable persons for free medical relief, 473, 478—the district of Marylebone, 474 — misappropriation of charitable funds, 475—methods of selection, 476—registration fee, &. gratuitous medicine, 477-type of the Hospital habit, ib.—necessity for isolation, 479—illness in lodgings, 480—the honorary physician, 481—increasing demand for pay-beds and pay-wards, 482-thriftless method of treating legacies, 483—difficulty of obtaining subscriptions, 484—the Hospital Sunday Fund, 485—adop-tion of the uniform system of account-keeping, 486 - example of varying rates, ib. — existence of special hospitals, 487—discovery of abuses in fever hospitals, 488—bad nursing in the Poor Law infirmaries, 489—endless multiplication of small 'specials,' 490 - improvement in nursing, 491-increase in the number of nurses, ib.—grievances, 492—demand for the registration, ib. suggestions for improvements, 493.

Ireland, the character of the people, 266-supposed injuries, 282-demand for Home Rule, ib. Italy, Art of bookbinding in, 187, 191.

Juvenal, contrasted with Persius, 165 —his literary merits, ib.—oratorical exercises, 166—unreal hatred of vice, 167-attacks on the dead, 168, 169 -word-pictures, 170-irrelevance of his graphic tableaux, 171-defects arising from his brilliance, 172indignation against patrician gladia-tors, 173—contempt for the Freed-man, 174—and the Greeks, 175 sentiments regarding slaves, 176sympathy with the poor, ib.

K

Kirby, T. F., 'Annals of Winchester,'

Latin Satire, 152-its origin, 4b .the Fescennine masque, the source of Comedy, 153—the Atellane farce, ib.—the mimes, 154—development of the versified letter to the public, 155—satire untouched by the Greeks, 6b.—Persius' literary position, 156— Juvenal, 165

Le Caron, Major Henri, as political spy, 246-defence for taking the Fenian oaths, 247—perilous adven-ture at Nashville, 248—his wife, 249 -services in the Fenian raid on Canada, 250-danger in obtaining documents, 251 - his warning to

Government, 6b.

Le Gascon, 197—his work and patrons, 198.

Leon, Ponce de, exploration in search of the Island Bimini, 32.

Lesné, his poem on bookbinding, 190. Liberals, The, disapproval of the Home Rule Bill, 286—attitude of inactivity,

Lords, House of, attitude to the Home Rule Bill, 268-its rejection, 572. Lotze on the influence of Christianity

in the relations of life, 121, note. Louis XVI., his accession, 217-dismisses Chancellor Maupeon, ib. indolence and weakness, 219restores the Parlements, ib .- popu-

larity, 221. Lowe, The Rt. Hon. Robert, M.P. See Sherbrooke, Viscount.

Lowe, Mrs., description of Sydney, 49.

Macaulay, T. B., his opinion of Torrington, 340, 341.

Machyn, Henry, The Diary of, 135. Macky, J., services and methods as spy, 240-dossier of Matthew Prior, 241.

Magalhaens, his proposal to Charles V., 33—makes the tour of the globe, 34, 35—killed at Zebu, 35.

Maioli, Thomaso, his exquisite taste in book decoration, 187-founder of the ornate school of binding in Italy,

Markof, Count, accredited Minister Plenipotentiary to Paris, 420—conduct towards Napoleon, 421.

Martha, Mons. C., his veneration and awe of Persius, 157.

McKenna, J. McParlan, 253—under-takes to unravel the Molly Maguire Conspiracy, ib .- commences operaestablishes himself in the 'Ancient Order of Hibernians,' 255 -his death resolved on, 257-imminent danger and escape, 258-261successful issue of his work, 261.

Moberly, Dr., Head Master of Win-chester, 377.

Molly Maguires,' secret society, 253 -the reign of terror, &.-description of the order, 256.

Montefiore, Lieut-Col., his evidence on the district of Marylebone, 474.

Napoleon, his scheme for invading England, 335-fails to obtain the command of the sea, th.—First Consul, 418—his foreign policy, th.—treat-ment of Count Markof, 420—assumes the Imperial title, 422—abandons the invasion of England, 423 crushes Austria, &.—protector of the Confederation of the Rhine, 424 defeats the Prussians, 425-at Warsaw, 426-interviews with Alexander, 428, 436—discussions with Tolstoi, 432—letter to Alexander, 434—victory of Wagram, 441— double negociation for marriage, 441, 442-ill-health, 442.

Napoleon and Alexander, 416—discovery of letters between, 4b.—meeting at Tilsit, 427—conference, 428-important conversations, 429negociations, 435—meeting at Erfurt, 436-438—final rupture, 442.

National Life and Character, 105-Roman jurisprudence, 120-influence of Christianity, ib .- effect of physical science, 121, 122—claims of the State, 123—invasion of educational liberty, 124-danger of retrogres-

sion from Christianity, 126-relative position of religion and ethics, 127. Nationalists, The, probable defence of

the agitation for Home Rule, 272internal disputes, 288.

New College, built by William of Wykeham, 364, 370.

Nicolas, Sir H., 'Proceedings and Ordinances of the Privy Council of

England, '131—collapse of the under-taking, 133— 'Synopsis of the Peerage,' 386—his principles, 388. Nifo, Augustino, the leading Averroist of Padua, 512-refutation of

Pomponatius' book, 513. Nisard, Mons. D., his criticism of Persius, 157.

O'Connell on the Repeal of the Union, 274-rejection of his motion, 276re-enters Parliament, ib .- resumes agitation for Home Rule, 277-mass meetings, 278-conviction, ib.-defection of the younger Home Rulers,

Opposition, The, decision to oppose the Repeal of the Union, 557 - substantial success, 568.

Owen, John, 'Skeptics of the Italian Renaissance, 495 - merits of his work, ib.-inferior essays, 496-on Bruno, ib .- Pomponatius and Vanini, 497-his inaccuracy, 499, note -extract of debate, 503.

Padua, University of, School of Philosophy, 500-disputes between the followers of Averroës and Aphrodisias, 502-the Bull of 1512, ib

Parkes, H., toyseller in Sydney, 53— his progressive handbill, 56.

Parnell, C. S., M.P., leader of the Home Rule cause, 281.

Payne, E. I., 'History of the New World,' 1—his theory of history, 3 —literary style, 4, 5—wanting in poetic insight, 6.

Payne, Roger, his intemperate habits,

208—value of his bindings, 209. Pearson, C. H., 'National Life and Character,' 105—object of his book, ib .- qualifications, 106 - on European colonization in Africa, 107in the Malay Archipelago, 108possibilities for settlement in Central Asia, ib.—growth of the Chinese, 109—probable increase of the inferior races, ib .- effect of the cessa-

tion of emigration, 110-universal military service, 111—on the re-sources of China, 112—growth of urban population, ib .- degeneracy of townsmen, 113—increase of national debts, 114—influence of the modern State, 115—relaxation of the marriage tie, 116—effect on society, 117-his doctrinairism, 118-opinions influenced by French Radicalism, ib.—unethical tone, 119—misconception of Christianity, 129. Peel, The Rt. Hon. Sir R., M.P., on

the maintenance of the Union, 275.

Peerage, The, 386-G. E. C.'s 'Complete Peerage, ib.—distinction be-tween 'dormant' and 'in abeyance,' 394—the Mowbray descent, ib.—the question of heraldry, 395—the Howard augmentation, ib.-Burke's Peerage, 397 - construction of a genuine pedigree, 400—forged pedigrees, 403 — Scottish genealogies, 404—assumption of titles, 405-409 the 'Restitution Act' of 1885, 405wrongful assumptions in England, 409—the Irish peerage, 410.

Persius, the Roman satirist, 156-his literary merit, 157-tortuousness of his style, 157–159—devotion to Cornutus, 160—association with Stoics, 160, 161—dislike of centurions, 162—religious thoughts and teaching, 163—the Christian tone in passages, 164-morality and craving after true liberty, ib. - compared with Juvenal, 165.

Pinzon, Vincent, expedition in 1499, 27—result of his voyage, 28.

Pitt, The Rt. Hon. Wm., M.P., coalition against, 532-dissolves Parliament, 533-invokes aid of the Whigs, 542. Polo, Marco, guide-book to Asia, 16.

Pomponatius, 497. See Sceptic. Privy Council under the Tudors, 131 its proceedings and ordinances, ib. series of publications issued by Record Office since 1857, ib.—reasons for omissions in the Register, 136entries relating to the English dominion in France, 137-surrender of Boulogne, ib .- loss of Calais, 138universal peculation, ib.-deterioration of the Navy, 139, 140-piracy and political disaffection, 140-State trial of Lord Seymour, 141-process of impoverishing the Crown, ib .financial procedure, 143—system of exaction, ib.—restrictions upon trade, 144 - prohibition of the export of coin, ib .- privileges of the Steel-yard, 145 - relations between England and Scotland, ib .- Wardens of the Marches, 146-condition of Ireland. 147 — interference of the Council, amusements of the people, 148—religious changes, 148–151.

Prussia, alliance with Russia, 424occupied by Napoleon, 425-rejects an armistice, 426-annihilated, 427.

Record Office, publication of 'The Chronicles and Memorials of Great Britain and Ireland during the Middle Ages,' from the invasion of the Romans to the reign of Henry VIII., 131—Annual Reports of the Deputy-Keepers, 132. 'Rig-Veda,' Hymns of the, 443. See

Vedic Mythology.

Ruette, Macé, inventor of marbled paper, 199.

Satire. See Latin Satire.

Sceptic of the Renaissance, A, 495— Pomponatius, founder of the new method, 497-his doctrines, 498birth, 499-studies medicine, 500-Professor of Philosophy, ib. — disciple of Aphrodisias, 502 — opponent of Achillini, 503 - marriage, 505-invited to fill the chair of Philosophy at Bologna, ib. - 'De Intensione' and 'De Reactione,' 506 - 'De Immortalitate,' ib.—reprinted, 521—repulsive style, 507—denial of immortality, ib .- profession of belief, 508—attack on his book, 509—refuta-tions, 510, 513—'Apologia,' 511— 'Defensorium,' 514—'De Nutritione, ib .- completes two treatises, 515- De Incantationibus, 517-on Fate, 518—death, 519—protection of Bologna, ib .- tribute to his honour, 520—second edition of his works, ib.
—notes of lectures, 521, 522—conservatism of his style, 523-portraits, 524, note.

Schaack, J., Captain of Police in Chicago, and anarchists' plots, 262. Sea, The Command of the, 329-differ-

ence between sovereignty of the sea as formerly claimed by this country and command of the sea in a strategical sense, 330, 331-seapower an instrument of expansion, 330 — strategic freedom of transit, 332—programme of the manœuvres, 333—Red and Blue Admirals, ib.

-illustrations of the principle, 334 -frustration of Napoleon's scheme, 335—defeat of the Armada, ib.—case of Carausius, 337-339 - Battle of Beachy Head, 339—objective of a hostile fleet, 353—use of a blockade, 355.

Sherbrooke, Viscount, 42-birth and parents, ib.—personal appearance, 43
—defective vision, ib.—at Winchester, 44 — method of strengthening his memory, ib.—at University College, 45-supporters of the Union Society. ib .- his ode, 46 - Fellowship and marriage, ib .- antipathy to reading for the Law, 47—verdict of the oculists, 48—sails for Sydney, ib. defence of Knatchbull, 49-appointed Crown Member for Sydney, 50-resignation, 51-speech foreshadowing Imperial Federation, to.—result of his labours, 52—founds the Atlas newspaper, to.—struggle against transportation, 53-55—elected people's member, 56—reply to his unemployed constituents, ib.—returns to England, 57—elected for Kidderminster, ib.—the fame of his bon mots, 58-charm of his conversation, 59-on the Government of India Bill, 60—Vice-President of the Board of Trade, 61—attack on Corporation dues, ib.—his system of sanitation, 61, 62-educational policy, ib. - vindication, 63 - resignation, 64—opposition to the Reform Bill, 64, 65—articles in the Quarterly Review, 65–67—on the staff of the Times, 68-Member for the London University, ib. — dislike to Mr. Disraeli, 69—Chancellor of the Exchequer, ib.—preference for facts over theories, 70-elevation to the peerage, 71.

Soma, 452-458. See Vedic Mythology. Spain, policy of colonization fails, 36. Spencer, Herbert, 'The Principles of Ethics,' 297.

Spies, Political, 235- the ethics of espionage, 236—limitations in the use, 237—John Macky, 240—Samuel Turner, 242—McNally, 244—Cap-tain Armstrong, 245—Major Le tain Armstrong, 245—Major Le Caron, 246–252—McKenna, 253–262 -Captain Schaack, 262-number in

Southern Europe, 263. Stanley, Lord, secession from the Whigs, 543-accession to the Conservative Cabinet of 1841, 544.

Stanmore, Lord (the Hon. Sir A. Gordon), 'The Earl of Aberdeen,'

Thies, C., Secretary of the Royal

• Free Hospital, 486—evidence of
over-assessment, tb.

Tilait, The Conference of, 428.

Torrington, Earl of, his rare fortitude and sense of duty, 340—foresees the designs of Louis XIV., 341—removal from the Admiralty, 342—commands the fleet, th.—defence before the court-martial, 343—insufficiency of his force, 344—defensive strategy, 345—immortal despatch, 346—order from the Queen, 347—tactics of the battle, 349–351—decision to retreat, 351—strategical insight 359 351—strategical insight, 352.
Toscanelli, Paolo, view of reaching land

of spices, 17-letter and map, 18.

Turgot, Minister of France, 217—his policy, 218—dismissal, 220.
Turner, Samuel, his first appearance as informer, 242—betrayal of his associates, 243-his death, 244,

U.

Ulster King-of-Arms, 396. See Burke. Union, terms of the, 271-plea for the Repeal, 273.

Unionist Campaign, The, 265.

Unionists, The, controversial successes, 284-effect on the electorate, 285persistent criticism, 292 — future policy, 293, 295.

Vanini, 497—an ardent Averroist, 517. Vedic Mythology, 443—peculiar value, 444—two schools of interpreters, tb.
—different names for the Sun, Dawn, and Moon, 445-chaotic phase, ib .dependence on the observation of sun and moon, 446—the solar and lunar dualism, 447-Vâtea or Avatea, ib .- legends of the Polynesians, 448, 449—movements of the moon, 449—reasons for the waxing and waning, 450, 460—the slow development, 451—the moon identified with Soma, 452, 455, 457—derivation of the word, 454—attempts to discover the plant, &—influence of the moon, 455-Soma, the invisible Lord of the moon, 456-number and various meanings, 457-different characters, 458-meaning of Ind-u, 459-the Moon the source of immortality, 461—importance of etymology, 462.

Vespucci, Amerigo, his voyages across the Atlantic, 29-31—his name given to the New World, 31.

Wace, his version of the Battle of Hastings, 78-inconsistency, 97. Walpole, Sir R., coalition against,

526-529.

Warton, Dr., Headmaster of Winchester, 382-rebellion of the boys, 383resignation, tb.

Waynflete transferred to Eton, 376. Weale, W. H. J., contributions to 'The

Bookbinder, 194. Winchester College, 358—celebration of the quingentenary, ib .- religious ceremonies, the secular festivities, 359—durability and beauty, 360—buildings, 364—accommodation for scholars, th.—the Statutes, 370—Society, th.—Warden, Founder's kin, 371-system of government, 372daily life of the boys, 373—origin of the word 'remedy,' 374—roughness and cruelty, ib.—'Boy Tutors,' Prefects, 375 - simplicity of life, ib .good feeling towards Eton, 376— origin of 'Commoners,' ib.—Headmasters, 377, 383–385—first boarding-houses, 378—hospitality, ib.—pre-sents, 379—Wardens, 380, 382 changes and visitations, 381-building of 'School,' 382-rebellion under Dr. Warton, 382.

Wykeham, William of, Founder of Winchester College, 360—obscurity of his birth and origin, 361-education, ib .- architectural works, 362the 'Perpendicular' style, ib.-knowthe 'Perpendicular' style, to.—know-ledge of details, 363—disposition of the buildings, 364—life as Chan-cellor and Prelate, 365—respected by all parties, to.—fall from power, 366—upholder of the rights of the Church, 367—Bishop of Winchester, to.—an 'indefatigable worker,' 368 resumes the building of the nave, ib. — appoints a suffragan, 369 — death, 370—his statutes, ib.

END OF THE HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-SEVENTH VOLUME.

